College and Research Libraries

Vol. III, No. 2, March, 1942
Association of College and Reference Libraries

College and Research Libraries

CARL M. WHITE, *Editor*

E. W. MCDIARMID, *Associate Editor*

College and Research Libraries is the official organ of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, a division of the American Library Association. It includes general articles, official reports, addresses of conference speakers, reviews of selected books, and news from the field of wide professional interest.

Manuscripts of articles and addresses should be addressed to the Office of the Editor, 426 Library, University of Illinois, Urbana. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Byron C. Hopkins, American Library Association, 520 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, at the time the notification is received of the issue in which the article is scheduled to appear. Requests to include news items should be addressed to Benjamin E. Powell, Secretary, Association of College and Reference Libraries, University of Missouri, Columbia. The scope of the journal does not permit inclusion of personal communications or exhaustive coverage by reviews of the literature of librarianship.

To editors: Material in *College and Research Libraries* is not copyrighted. The editors assume editorial responsibility, but do not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by writers. No comment or pronouncement can be cited as official endorsement of the Association of College and Reference Libraries or of the American Library Association. Such action can only be taken through a formal vote of the associations.

Subscription price: to members of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, $2 per year; to nonmembers, libraries, and other agencies, $3 in the U.S., Canada, and Latin America; in other countries $3.25; single copy, $1. Payment for subscriptions should be made to the American Library Association, 520 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

Members of the American Library Association may become members of the Association of College and Reference Libraries by indicating this as the division of their choice when paying A.L.A. dues, without the payment of additional dues. A.L.A. members wishing to belong to more than one division must pay to the A.L.A. an additional 20 per cent of their A.L.A. dues for each additional division.

College and Research Libraries is published quarterly, December, March, June, and September at 520 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill., by the American Library Association, and printed at 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis. Entered as second class matter May 8, 1940, at the post office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of March 3, 1879, with an additional entry at Menasha, Wis.

College and Research Libraries

Contents

March, 1942
Volume III, Number 2

(Continued on next page)

Contents

(Continued)

NEW SUBSTITUTION PLAN FOR COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES

The plan permitting the substitution of *College and Research Libraries* for the A.L.A. *Handbook* and *Proceedings* numbers of the *A.L.A. Bulletin* by A.C.R.L. members paying dues of $5 or more was modified at the Boston meeting by action of the A.C.R.L. Board of Directors and the A.L.A. Council. The new plan provides that A.C.R.L. members paying dues of $5 or more may make this substitution and receive a credit of fifty cents toward the normal $2 subscription to *C. and R.L.*

At the Cincinnati meeting in 1940 the A.L.A. Council adopted a recommendation of a special A.L.A. committee permitting this substitution as an experiment for two years beginning January 1, 1941, in order to determine the effect on income and budget. The actual savings in publication expenses for the *A.L.A. Bulletin* resulting from the 730 substitutions in 1940-41 amounted to forty-one cents per substitution. Since this did not equal the loss of revenue to the *College and Research Libraries* budget from the 730 subscribers, a serious deficit threatened the journal's budget. The Board of Directors of A.C.R.L., after considering the problem at two sessions during the Boston Conference and after consultation with several members of the original substitution committee, decided to propose a compromise arrangement rather than to recommend that the substitution be dropped outright or that the deficit be allowed to run for a second year. Subsequent action by the A.L.A. Council supported this compromise arrangement by allowing a fifty-cent credit to the *College and Research Libraries* budget for each A.C.R.L. member making the substitution.

For the coming year, therefore, a subscriber wishing to make the substitution will need to pay in addition to his dues, $1.50 for *College and Research Libraries.* For an additional fifty cents he may also receive the *Handbook* and *Proceedings* numbers of the *A.L.A. Bulletin.*

By CHARLES H. BROWN

Librarians and the War

President Brown's opening remarks at the meeting of the A.L.A. Council, December 29, 1941.

FOR ALL AMERICANS, but for librarians particularly, the events of the last few weeks as well as the history of the past twenty years have special significance. We librarians, together with other groups of educators, have a vital interest in the outcome of this war. A victory for the aggressors would mean the end of the American public library as we know it. In the British Empire and in the United States the public library has developed as a result of basic principles of freedom of speech and respect for individual rights. The triumph of the Nazi doctrine would destroy our freedom of thought, our right to study both sides of the question, and our privilege to read and think for ourselves. These are the fundamental principles to which we librarians have dedicated our lives. They are fundamental to librarianship.

These principles date back to the American Bill of Rights, adopted 150 years ago, and in part admirably summarized seventy-five years ago. The words of Abraham Lincoln apply far more strongly today than they did in 1865, if by civil war we understand a war for civilization. "Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. . . ."

Failure of Librarians

A consideration of past mistakes is valuable as a means of avoidance of mistakes in the future. Although the fundamental principles of American librarianship have been seriously threatened by the ideologies which developed during the last ten years, we librarians have failed to understand, and to aid our communities to understand, the significance of nationalistic movements. Since we ourselves have not understood, we could not lead others. Mr. MacLeish warned us eighteen months ago at Cincinnati and urged us to exert leadership in our communities.[1] We could not, even as late as 1940, unitedly listen to his appeal. At the same meeting one group of librarians, fortunately a small one, issued a request to the President that no military aid be sent to Great Britain. If it had not been for the courage of the British, if it had not been that the people of the United States in general favored a policy of assistance, then the future of this country and of our democracy would be dark indeed.

The indifference and lack of understanding by our own people are partly responsible for the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. The material for the bombs which killed our soldiers and sailors at Pearl Harbor and the gasoline which brought the bombers there, may well have come from the United States. We sold the

[1] MacLeish, Archibald. "The Librarian and the Democratic Process." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 34:385-88, 421-22, June 1940; also 34:419, June 1940.

Japanese material to use for killing our people. Even while we were criticizing the policy of the British appeasers, the futility of our own policy of appeasement was not understood by the American people.

Pearl Harbor clearly indicates that the Atlantic and Pacific oceans are no protection. Pearl Harbor is farther from Japan than Boston from the European continent. If the recent disaster has shown the American people the dangers of isolationism, then the sacrifice at Pearl Harbor may not have been in vain.

The officers, boards, and committees of the American Library Association are counting on your undivided loyalty. We have taken the liberty of pledging the support of every member of the A.L.A. in the United States to the government for whatever aid we can give in the prosecution of this war. There is much we can accomplish if we work together wholeheartedly and harmoniously to win the war, leaving less pressing tasks for the postwar period.

Librarians Can Aid

What can the sixteen thousand members of the American Library Association do to assist in bringing about victory? We certainly cannot continue all our customary professional routines. Much of the work we usually do will have to be abandoned for the duration, to be replaced by education for victory and for a world order which will make future wars impossible.

According to a recent estimate, in 1918 five men were required to manufacture war materials to every soldier in the service. Now the proportion is eighteen to one. We must help in making these war workers efficient. If books are needed in defense areas, if research publications are needed by government technicians or in research departments of manufacturing firms, they must be supplied even if the purchase of fiction and recreational reading is curtailed. No reader must leave a public library without the specific material he needs if he is concerned in any way, directly or indirectly, with war activities. No research department must do without material that can be found anywhere in the United States.

There is an even more important field for librarians—the promotion of civilian morale. Our people must understand the significance of events, the dangers from inflation, the necessity that we support the program of the Treasury in advertising defense bonds, that we cooperate in the understanding and administration of priorities, that we pay careful attention to the maintenance of the health of our citizens. Our libraries must be actual centers of information.

Broad Field

Civilian morale is one division of a broad field. We librarians must take an active part in the educational work of our communities. We must stimulate thought on international problems. We must encourage study and forum discussions in order that all the American people may understand the danger of isolationism and the need for international cooperation and understanding. If a world order is to be built which will prevent future wars, then it must be done by voters who understand. Furthermore, our people must realize that future world peace cannot be assured by hatred, by enmity, by ignoring the cultures and accomplishments even of our enemies. We librarians can assist in this war by

(Continued on page 116)

By DONALD CONEY

Libraries and the Long Haul

A message from the President of the Association of College and Reference Libraries.

IT DOES NOT TAKE much wit or imagination to see behind today's headlines the call for a long and determined effort to turn defense into victory, but it takes an acute awareness of reality to convert this common knowledge into action. Librarians of scholarly libraries, like their colleagues of the faculty, are often accused of lying snug in their ivory towers, but I doubt if there is any group in the country more fully aware of the dangers and demands of the present crisis than college and university faculties. In this awareness, librarians should not lag behind.

Institutions of higher learning are confronted by a wartime dilemma, and the problems common to dilemma-solving must be shared by their libraries as the paramount service agencies of the scholar and the learner. On the one hand, scholarly libraries must assume their appropriate share of immediate and direct contribution to the war effort in services and in personnel; on the other, there is the necessity, of utmost importance, to maintain normal functions in the service of present training and research so that the postwar era may not be barren of hope. The first problem is today's, and the second is tomorrow's. Tomorrow cannot be robbed for the present, but today's work must be done. Librarians must not collapse supinely in the face of this dilemma. They must attack it positively and hold the scales in even balance between emergency requirements and certain demands of the future.

Immediately confronting us is the problem of throwing our libraries into gear with the special wartime activities of the institutions with which we are associated. The supply of materials for defense training courses no longer presents new problems to us, but we are now confronted with the need to act as information centers on civilian defense, on student guidance with reference to enlistment in the armed forces, on the supply of materials dealing with the causes and future of the war, and presently, when the country has got its second wind, on the problems of the postwar period—that time which is the only excuse for the present crisis. These problems and others that will spring into being with each new pressure of events are "must" activities. They must be dealt with swiftly, efficiently, with imagination and with skill.

Concurrently, although we cannot do business as usual, we must carry on much of our usual business in preparation for the greater emergencies after the war. The essential education of the rising generation must not suffer if the war is to be worth fighting. If we want to live in a world of individual freedom, tomorrow's men and women must be educated to an appreciation of its value. If the lamp of knowl-

(Continued on page 116)

By LOUIS R. WILSON

The Significance of the Joint University Libraries

Dean Wilson, of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, presented this paper at the dedication of the Joint University Library, Nashville, Tennessee, December 6, 1941.

THE DEDICATION of a new library building to serve the students and scholars of a great modern university is always an occasion for special ceremonial. And well it should be. It marks the addition to the varied resources of the university of a new, carefully planned building set apart to aid the university in achieving the ends for which the university has been established and maintained by society. It tremendously reinforces the university's efforts to conserve and revitalize knowledge and ideas from the past, to discover new knowledge and develop new ideas, and to pass this cumulated heritage on to succeeding generations through instruction, publication, and public service. It signalizes the supplementation of old forces and the release of new forces within society which inevitably contribute to its increasing understanding and cultural enrichment.

The dedication of the Joint Library of Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Scarritt College for Christian Workers shares this general significance with the dedication of all university libraries. But it does not stop there. It does something more. It has a significance peculiar to itself which derives from other causes than those just mentioned. This significance is at once so great and so unusual that we may do well to take time to analyze it in order that we may better understand just what it is.

First of all, the dedication of this building marks the culmination of a full decade of institutional planning by educational foundations, higher institutions of education, and libraries which has resulted in a clearly defined, purposeful program of educational cooperation. It makes concrete in brick and stone a type of planning of which there have been all too few examples in the past and of which it may be hoped there will be an increasing number in the future. Here the normal loyalties and rivalries of three institutions which usually tend to keep institutions apart have given place to the united consideration of means for enriching teaching and research insofar as this can be accomplished by the elimination of duplication in teaching at the undergraduate level, by the concentration of facilities and resources in the fields of graduate and professional study, and by the provision and support of a great joint library. Here is an enterprise involving three student bodies, three faculties, three libraries, and two educational foundations, which brings them all together in a unified program of education, of which this splendid new library building is the visible

symbol. In these respects, the dedication of this building, to the usefulness and beauty of which librarians, builder, and architect have contributed, stands out as an instance of a new and significant type of educational statesmanship.

This dedication is significant for a second reason. It marks the emergence of a new type of educational administrative device. Prior to the 1930's, the attitudes of American institutions of higher education were characterized by rugged individualism. Funds for higher education were relatively abundant in the 1920's, and every university and college looked to the day when it would be bigger and richer and capable of outdistancing all its competitors. University libraries shared this spirit and attempted to make themselves self-sufficient. In the two decades of the 1920's and 1930's, while they more than doubled their holdings, they constantly bid against one another for rare materials and thereby increased the cost to themselves and to other libraries alike. They, and the boards of control of the institutions of which they were parts, did not set their legal staffs to work to devise means by which they could cooperate. The legal instrument, however, by means of which this joint library has been brought into being, is a newly conceived type of educational document. Although cooperative agreements among educational institutions and libraries have existed heretofore, the educational authorities and legal staffs who drafted this instrument did not find an educational model ready at hand. It is a document that renounces competition among institutions and libraries as a way of life and sets up in its stead a plan of cooperation for common benefits. It calls into being what, for lack of a better term, may be called an educational holding company organized not for financial profit but for the continuous cultivation of men's minds. It has already been widely studied. Principles very similar to those which it embraces have been applied by the libraries of Harvard University and other New England institutions in providing a common storage library for little-used books. It will continue to be studied by other colleges and universities which seriously seek to maintain and improve library facilities for instruction and research under the steadily increasing financial difficulties of the time.

Program of Curriculum Revision

The arrangement by which the joint library was brought into being is significant for another reason. It was worked out as a part of a program of curriculum revision in which not only the curriculums of all three institutions were considered together but the demands which the curriculums made upon the libraries of all three institutions were also considered. This again is an instance of an educational procedure which has likewise been all too infrequently employed by institutions when they have been involved in curriculum revision. Many institutions develop new plans for improving instruction or for carrying on investigation in new fields without including their libraries in the planning, and then are surprised when the effectiveness of the program is not so great as they had thought it should be, because proper library provision had not been made in the planning. It is only recently that a certain college president was heard to remark with evident, but ill-founded pride, that he had just finished putting through an extensive curriculum revision in his institution, that next year he was going to concentrate his attention

on the development of facilities for the study of art, and that after he had completed these programs he was going to do something about the library! It did not seem to occur to him that unless these undertakings were properly supported with library resources and integrated with intelligent library use, the results he expected from them could not be achieved. The success of the survey courses at the University of Chicago and of the house plan and tutorial instruction at Harvard is attributable in part to the fact that both institutions devoted as much consideration to the selection and provision of the library materials which were to support the programs as they devoted to their organization and general content.

Staffs United

Here on these campuses a significant procedure was followed. The instructional and research staffs united to consider the elimination of competition and duplication of effort at the undergraduate level in order that work at the graduate and professional levels might be increased. They were conscious of the fact that no effective program of collaboration in these fields could be worked out which failed to include within it a plan of library development as well. Consequently, plans for providing library resources to support specialization and research in desired fields were made an integral part of the whole program. All of the planning went forward together, and the provision for this new building, for securing additional endowment for library purposes, and for increased library operating funds was, in fact, precedent to other developments which may now be expected to follow.

This is the kind of curriculum planning involving the careful integration of curriculum and library use, which, if followed from the elementary school, through high school, college, and university, will tremendously increase the effectiveness of American teaching and research.

Role of Library in Higher Education

On a number of occasions I have spoken of the role of the library in higher education and especially in higher education in the South where library resources have not been nearly so abundant as they have been in other parts of the nation. This audience knows the nature of the limitations which result from this lack and their effect upon productive scholarship. It knows that most Southern universities have been unable to undertake graduate work in many departments leading to the doctorate because essential library resources are lacking. It knows that thousands of graduate students have been lost to the schools and colleges and the business and professional life of the South because they went elsewhere for graduate training, and, after completing it, did not return to the South. It knows that the training of thousands of other students who were unable to use such materials in Southern universities has been less effective than it should be because of this lack. The dedication of this new library is of the greatest significance to higher education in this region because it marks the firm establishment of a new concentration of library resources upon which distinctive graduate work can be confidently based. With this concentration of four hundred thousand volumes, supplemented by the services of union catalogs and microphotography laboratories, which bring the total library resources of the city to more than eight hundred thousand volumes, students and scholars in Nashville can go about their daily work

with new confidence. Nashville in a truer sense than ever before becomes a university center which not only can support the work of scholars here, but can make more fruitful the work of scholars on all the university campuses of the South. This installation of new resources not only reinforces work here but adds to the combined resources of all the centers of learning stretching from the nation's capital to the Mexican border.

Contribution to Resources for Research

A further significance of the dedication is to be seen in the contribution which the joint library makes to the total resources for research of the nation. In the official year 1935-36 of the American Library Association the status of the Committee on Resources of American Libraries was changed from that of a committee to that of a board, with enlarged powers, and a committee on microphotography was established. Since that date a conscious, well-conceived library program has been developed which has had two major objectives. The first has been the location and description of library materials essential to research. The second has been the increased provision of bibliographical apparatus and films for the use of scholars. Librarians and scholars in all parts of the nation have participated in this undertaking and have had the satisfaction of witnessing its successful development. Union catalogs and bibliographical apparatus have been provided in a number of the major libraries in various regions of the country for the location of research materials. The resources of the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress have been greatly extended by the inclusion of cards from hundreds of libraries and regional union catalogs. It has, as a result, become the ultimate source to which the scholar, wherever located, may confidently look for bibliographical assistance. A number of notable microphotography laboratories have been established in university and research libraries for the reproduction of rare yet indispensable materials. Machines for the satisfactory reading of films have been developed and are to be found in reference rooms and special collections on campuses everywhere. The resources of a number of major research libraries have been systematically described by subject fields and significant titles through library surveys and other publications. A conference of national scope and attended by librarians, officers of universities, and members of learned societies has been held, which dealt with many phases of library cooperation and specialization. The Library of Congress, through the aid of an educational foundation, has set up a temporary Division of Library Cooperation, by means of which further aid to libraries and scholars is anticipated. A report growing out of a nationwide study of union catalogs and describing the nature of their services is now in press, and two editions of a publication describing the resources of libraries and special collections useful in national defense have recently been made available to the public. Altogether, this program is one of the most notable undertakings in America for the advancement of scholarship and it is one in which the librarians of Southern universities have played a leading role. In this movement the joint library, through its librarian and the librarians of Nashville, has taken a conspicuous part. Through their planning with the instructional and research staffs here, and their cooperation with librarians throughout the country, they have aided these three in-

stitutions to make a splendid contribution to the human and cultural resources of the nation.

Will Attract Other Gifts

A sixth significance of this dedication is to be found in the fact, for it is a well-proven fact, that this concentration of library buildings, resources, and staffs will attract other collections and gifts devoted to library service. Great libraries attract great gifts. Individual friends of the library, organized friends of the library, alumni, and nonalumni, will inevitably be impressed with the concentration and multiplication of resources represented here, and when seeking ways through which to contribute to educational effectiveness will find in this library the means which will aid them to this end. Splendid evidence of this fact is already here. I have spoken of the educational foundations, of the three institutions, and of the three libraries which have participated in bringing this new resource of learning and investigation into being. But I am not unmindful of the fact that supplementing their effort has been the significant support of students and members of these faculties and of men and women of this city, of this state, and of the nation, who, through their interest and gifts have made this library their very own. Without their aid, this building would not have been possible. They will be succeeded tomorrow, and in the lengthening future, by others who will add to what they have so generously helped to begin.

The final significance which may be associated with this dedication is the part which this new library should play in preparing teachers and librarians for more effective teaching and research. In 1931 in a paper which I read before the American Library Association at Yale entitled "The Emergence of the College Library," I presented evidence which seemed to me conclusive that the college library was then moving forward into new areas of usefulness in the field of higher education. The evidence seemed to be of many kinds. New curriculums were being established here and there which called for greater use of library service. Libraries were expanding their book collections and adding to their staffs personnel imbued with new educational ideals. Books and articles by college librarians, college presidents, and officers of educational foundations dealt with the larger role which the college library should play in the educational process. The college library in reality could be said to be entering upon a new period of usefulness in which teaching with books was becoming an important method of teaching.

Similar Movement in Other Libraries

Today it seems to me that a similar movement can be detected in other types of libraries. From the elementary school through the junior college, similar stirrings are to be noted. Better library quarters have been provided; more books have been purchased; more periodicals have been placed on the shelves; more radios, records, slides, and films have been secured; more librarians have been put into service; more superintendents, principals, and teachers have gained some understanding of the role of the library in teaching; and more school boards and state legislatures have provided increased funds for library purposes in many types of libraries.

This situation presents one of the greatest challenges to the institutions located on these campuses. These institutions, in-

cluding as they do a university, a teachers college, a school for the training of librarians, a practice school library for elementary and secondary schools, and a library embodying all the best features of modern library service, have the opportunity of training prospective teachers and librarians at all levels of education in such a way as to enable them better to integrate library use and teaching than teachers and librarians have been able to in the past, and thereby tremendously increase their educational efficiency. If I am not greatly mistaken, it is just at this point where library use and teaching unite that American education will make its greatest advance in the next decade. Here in the libraries and classrooms of these adjoining campuses, the foundation has been laid for uniting teachers and librarians in a program of training which should make certain that all prospective teachers and educational administrators will understand how to utilize library materials in effective teaching. Unfortunately, many teachers do not know how to do this today. Furthermore, graduate study is generally so preoccupied with specialization and the use of highly specialized source materials that the prospective teacher has little opportunity while working for advanced degrees to become familiar with materials which can be used effectively in teaching at other levels. The foundation has likewise been laid here that should make certain that prospective librarians at all educational levels will understand the educational aims of the institutions which they serve and the best methods by which library materials may be used in their attainment. Fortunately for the improvement of teaching, the institutions which share in the use of the library resources of these campuses likewise share the philosophies of education and librarianship which insist upon the combination of these important understandings without which teaching cannot achieve its greatest effect. If those who teach and those who administer libraries here imbue prospective teachers and librarians with these philosophies and send them thus equipped into the schools and colleges of the nation, education will take on a new and fuller meaning.

Forty Years' Development

Forty years ago this December I wrote my first report as librarian of a neighboring Southern university. In the four decades that have intervened I have constantly studied the growth of libraries in higher institutions of education in this region. I have witnessed the movement for greater library resources, for more ample library support, for more adequate library buildings, go forward. I have seen the book collections reach the first one hundred thousand mark, then the quarter and half million marks. Now two are on the climb to the million mark. I have watched budgets grow to $10,000 annually, to $50,000, to $100,000, and more. I have seen special collections of a few hundred or a few thousand titles become so extensive as to give distinction to any institution which might possess them. I have witnessed from Virginia to Texas the erection of university library buildings that in their organization and size reflect the expanding conception of the importance of library resources and service in higher education. At times this movement has been slow. But at all times it has been forward.

Today as I consider this new achievement, I congratulate you, individually and collectively, who have made this building

(Continued on page 138)

By A. F. KUHLMAN

The Program of the Joint University Libraries

This paper was presented at the dedication of the Joint University Library, Nashville, Tennessee, December 6, 1941, by Dr. Kuhlman, director.

THE JOINT UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES represent a new pattern in higher education, research, and library service. They are a cooperative enterprise for the development of more adequate library resources primarily for three neighboring institutions—Peabody College, Scarritt College, and Vanderbilt University—and secondarily for the scholars of the South Central region.

This cooperative library enterprise was launched as the next step toward the realization of a university center of first rank in Nashville. The plan for such a cooperative regional university center in Nashville, supported by adequate library resources and services, was the direct outgrowth of a comprehensive self-survey in 1935-36 of the educational and research programs and the library facilities and needs of the three institutions. That survey culminated in dual action: to coordinate and extend the curricula for advanced education and research in this educational center, and to develop a joint or cooperative university library system. A preliminary plan providing for the Joint University Libraries was developed as a part of the survey report, and it was agreed to and signed by the chief administrative heads of these neighboring schools on March 25, 1936.

This preliminary plan immediately became the basis for a two-fold approach to the library project. One, an interim organization was set up in June 1936, under which a director of libraries was appointed, and two, the General Education Board made two appropriations—one of four annual grants to help finance the interim joint library organization and to acquire basic reference tools and important periodicals, and a second appropriation to prepare a union catalog of Nashville libraries and to acquire a Library of Congress depository catalog.

Thus the stage was set for action. First, a permanent plan had to be worked out for a cooperative or joint library system which was acceptable to the three cooperating institutions and the educational foundations. Such a plan had to cover ownership, financing, control, and general policies of administration of the libraries. Second, the requirements or functions of a central joint library building had to be determined and agreed upon, and third, the current administration of the library services on the three campuses, including a series of special cooperative projects, was to be carried forward.

The problems of ownership, control, and management of the Joint University

Library were difficult, for there was no existing precedent for such a cooperative enterprise. A solution was found by following through the same principles of organization that are the basis of the ownership, control, and administration of an efficiently organized library in a single institution of higher learning.

Plan of Ownership

The plan, developed and adopted in 1937 and 1938, provides that the ownership of the Joint University Libraries and their endowment and operating funds shall be vested in the corporate bodies, specifically for the benefit of the three schools. A board of library trustees, selected from and representing the boards of control of the three institutions, is responsible for the control of the libraries. This board of library trustees includes the chief administrative officers of the three institutions, who constitute the executive committee to which the general supervision of the libraries is delegated. This executive committee selects and appoints the director of libraries who is directly responsible to it for the administration of the libraries. It also names the joint faculty library committee.

On the financial side, the program of the Joint University Libraries was made possible through substantial gifts of the General Education Board and the Carnegie Corporation and the generous contributions of more than five thousand students, faculty members, alumni, employees, and other friends of these three institutions in the campaign of 1938.

In addition, the three schools each agreed to contribute (for the current support of the libraries) at least the equivalent of twenty-five dollars per student registered per academic year.

Cooperative Bibliographical Projects

Thus the Joint University Libraries got under way. One of the first cooperative projects undertaken was the preparation of a union catalog of the principal libraries of Nashville: the public library, the state library of Tennessee, the libraries of Fisk University, Meharry Medical College, Peabody College, Scarritt College, and all of the libraries of Vanderbilt University except the school of law. The initial project of reproducing the main entry cards for all books in these libraries as of September 1, 1936, was financed by the General Education Board, and since then this catalog has been serviced and kept up by the Joint University Libraries.

This union catalog is basic to the whole cooperative scheme represented by the Joint University Libraries. In fact, it carries cooperation through all of the large libraries of Nashville and places them in a position to play a regional role in the larger library cooperation that is now being developed on a nationwide scale. This catalog makes it possible to avoid wasteful duplication and to establish a real division of labor by function among the libraries. It also serves as a basic reference and research tool for locating books now in Nashville.

The second bibliographical project carried through by the Joint University Libraries was the acquisition and maintenance of a Library of Congress depository catalog. It now includes 1,750,000 entries—the most important bibliographical tool America has produced. It is especially useful in establishing correct entries in ordering and cataloging books as well as in scholarly research. It also expedites interlibrary loans.

To these two bibliographical tools—the union and Library of Congress catalogs—

many published bibliographical and reference works have been added by means of the special grants of the General Education Board.

Provisions in the Joint Library Building

The larger program and objectives of Joint University Libraries are further expressed in the functions provided for in the new library building. In planning its location, arrangements, and facilities, an effort has been made to adapt it primarily to the institutional and research requirements of this university center.

Central Site

Ever since the inception of the idea of a great cooperative library to serve Peabody, Scarritt, and Vanderbilt, it has been clear that a site as central as possible to the classrooms of the three institutions was essential to its success. Such a site, within a five-minute walk of the farthest classroom of the three schools, was found at the intersection of their campuses. This plot of ground on Hillsboro Road is adjacent to the northwest portion of the Peabody campus and to the southwest portion of the Scarritt campus. It was deeded to the joint library project by Vanderbilt University.

Collegiate Gothic Architecture

The building is designed in collegiate Gothic architecture which blends with the style of the nearby buildings and is the type in which Henry C. Hibbs of Nashville, the resident architect, has won great distinction in designing buildings for several American colleges and universities. The joint library building has two fronts. The principal and most imposing front, four stories in height, faces Hillsboro Road and will be the easiest approach to the building for students from Peabody and Scarritt, and for the public. The front of the building on the west will be the logical approach for Vanderbilt students and faculty.

Functions Provided for in Building

In the planning and arrangement of the new building provision has been made for the following basic library functions:

(1) Housing of books for ready access and efficient preservation.

(2) Suitable reading room space.

(3) Reference and advanced study for students.

(4) Faculty research.

(5) Acquisition and processing of books.

(6) Reproduction of materials.

In planning these functions for the new Joint University Library, due consideration was given to a functional organization of library materials and educational programs of the three schools. Under this plan the new building serves as the central or general library for this university center. Its chief resources and services will be in the humanities, social sciences, general science, religion, engineering, and library science. The general library and the libraries in engineering and religion of Vanderbilt University are completely absorbed in this new building. Their identity as Vanderbilt library agencies are wiped out and they become the core of holdings in the new building.

The Peabody library will be continued, and an effort will be made to make it an outstanding special library in education, psychology, and in those subjects that are taught at Peabody only, such as art, home economics, library science, music, and physical education. Much of the general material now in the Peabody library will

be transferred to the central building.

In like manner the library of the Vanderbilt School of Medicine will remain in the building which accommodates that school and hospital, but it is expected that some of the general biological material will be transferred from that building to the new library building.

Specialized departmental libraries in biology, chemistry, geology, and physics will be continued in the buildings containing the laboratories in those subjects on the Vanderbilt campus. It is planned that the contents of those libraries can be limited to the specialized scientific and technical literature in those respective subjects and that the general science material bearing on those subjects, will be housed centrally.

The library of the School of Law of Vanderbilt University will continue to be housed in the building with the faculty, classrooms, and other facilities of the school, because the American Law School Association requires that this be done.

Finally, the library of Scarritt College will be continued, but its emphasis will be on missions and those subjects that in the future will be taught in this center only at Scarritt College.

Housing of Books

The first requirement of any library building is convenient and adequate space for arranging, housing, and preserving books. By adopting an H-shaped building, the stacks have been placed at the center, leaving the wings on the north and south as reading and work rooms. The book stacks are built from the ground to the full height of the center of the building, eight tiers in height. They are designed to accommodate approximately five hundred thousand volumes now, but are so constructed that the capacity can be increased to more than a million volumes by extending the center of the building vertically.

The book stacks installed are the flexible type (made by Snead and Company) in which columns and shelving can be removed and spaces cleared and used for study or work areas as the need arises. The entire building has been made as flexible as possible, without bearing walls, so that it can be expanded and so that its functions in various spaces and rooms can be altered at a minimum cost without destroying the unity and efficiency of the building.

Reserve Reading

In planning the reading rooms of the library, an attempt has been made to adapt them to the varied requirements of this educational center. This necessitated a reserve reading room with a seating capacity of 160. It was placed on the first floor, north wing, so that heavy traffic to it would not disturb students in other reading rooms. In purpose and arrangement this room reflects one of the significant changes in the methods of teaching that have come into prominence within the past two decades—the centering of the courses primarily in the use of prescribed library materials rather than in student-bought textbooks. Few college subjects can now be taught satisfactorily with student-bought textbooks. Access must be given to a great variety of books and periodicals. This can be achieved by assembling the required reading in one place, permitting it to circulate for limited periods only.

This reserve reading room is a memorial to Joel O. Cheek—a gift of his children.

Adjacent to the large reading room for reserve materials two small conference rooms have been provided: one where

students can gather who wish to work on their assignments in groups, and another where students can meet instructors to discuss reading requirements.

Reference Service

Provision has been made for a second type of study, namely, reference work, which falls midway between reading and research. The entire second floor of the north wing, seating 135, is devoted to this work. Here are made available on open shelves, under the direction of a skilled reference librarian, general reference works and the current numbers of periodicals. The importance of this division in this South Central region deserves special stress in view of the large amount of graduate work, including the training of librarians, that is centered here.

This reference room is a memorial to James H. Kirkland, the late chancellor of Vanderbilt University, made possible by his friends, members of the Board of Trust, students, faculty, and alumni of Vanderbilt University.

Two special reading rooms—one in religion and one in engineering—are provided in the south wing. Separate reading rooms are provided in these two subjects to give status to and to further the work of the professional schools in these subjects. There is not at present a competent library in either of these subjects in the entire South.

Browsing Room

Another type of reading has been provided for in a room off the main book delivery hall on the second floor—namely, browsing or recreational reading. Such a room has been included because it is recognized that one of the objects of a liberal arts college and of its library is to develop in students a permanent interest in reading and in the enjoyment of good literature.

There is general agreement that one means of encouraging cultural or recreational reading is through such a browsing room, comfortably and attractively furnished, which contains interesting, readable books and periodicals, giving the student direct contact with material on the shelves.

Provisions for Graduate Work and for Research

While undergraduate work concerns itself primarily with the diffusion of funded knowledge on the part of the teacher and its acquisition and mastery on the part of the student through intensive prescribed reading, the purpose of graduate work at its best, especially on the doctoral level, is the discovery of new knowledge through original research.

To enable the graduate student to work to the best advantage it has been found desirable to provide him with his own assigned space where he can leave his working equipment. The entire third floor of the north wing, accommodating 150 persons, is planned for graduate study. Here individual table space with a book rack is assigned to students who are working on dissertations or important research projects. Bookcases on the walls of this room contain scholarly periodicals and fundamental works through which students can keep in touch with the progress of thought in their special field of concentration.

This room is a memorial to Bruce R. Payne, late president of Peabody College. It was made possible by his friends, members of the Board of Trustees, students, and the faculty of Peabody College.

Additional facilities have been provided for graduate students, especially on the Ph.D. level, in the bookstacks in the form of ninety individual working spaces or carrels, equipped with a desk and bookshelves.

In order that the Joint University Library may be of further assistance in the graduate work of the three schools, provision has also been made for five seminar rooms seating from twelve to eighteen students each and a bibliographical laboratory seating sixty. They are designed as meeting places for advanced classes for seminar periods requiring the use of library materials as a basis for discussion and research that is in progress.

As a further aid to research forty-two faculty research studies have been provided for scholars on the campuses of the three schools as well as scholars from the South Central region, who will find it convenient to come here for their work. These rooms are not offices and no permanent assignments are contemplated. They are to be assigned to men who are working on research projects for the duration of the project and then are to be reassigned.

Centralization of Chief Functions

The chief functions of the library are centralized on the second building floor, which is at the level of the fourth stack tier. On this floor in the south wing the receiving room opens directly into a staff work room sufficiently large to accommodate all of the preparatory processes. The main reference room, containing the current periodicals and basic reference tools, occupies the north wing of this same floor. In the central portion of the building on this floor and connecting directly with the reference room and the staff work room, as well as with the stacks, is the central book delivery hall, containing all of the public catalogs including the union catalog of Nashville libraries and the Library of Congress catalog. In addition, the library office and a browsing room are on this floor.

Reproduction of Materials

Another significant aid to research has been provided for in the department of microphotography. In fact, the most important new aid to science and scholarship since the invention of printing is the application of photography to the reproduction and preservation of materials for research.

Microphotography makes it possible for the Joint University Libraries: (1) To save library materials printed on perishable wood pulp paper, such as newspapers. (2) To use film copies as a substitute for bulky materials, such as government documents and newspapers, thus reducing two costly items—binding and housing space. A filmed volume of a newspaper occupies only one fiftieth of the space of the original. (3) To carry on interlibrary loans with other libraries. (4) To duplicate manuscripts and other records of which only one copy exists. (5) To obtain at nominal cost indispensable materials that are rare and out of print.

In view of the role that will be played by microphotography in the research of the future in the South, the area in the north wing, fourth floor, will be devoted to a microphotographic laboratory. It is being equipped with a large camera. Portable cameras will also be provided for graduate students and members of the faculty to use in the field to gather source materials.

Another essential phase in microphotography is the use of reading machines

by means of which the content of films can be enlarged to the original size or larger, making the reading of the film comparatively easy.

The microphotographic laboratory is a gift of Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Leech and Dr. and Mrs. George Mayhew in memory of Isaac Franklin McLean, father of Mrs. Leech.

Treasure Room

Another important division of the library is the treasure room or rare book room. It is located on the fourth floor, south wing, and is nearing completion. This room is intended as the center for the collection, preservation, and use of three important types of materials. First, papers, letters, diaries, and other human documents dealing with Nashville and the South Central region. Second, in this room will be collected specimens of the outstanding monuments of the book arts, both as to printing and as to bookbinding. Here it should be possible to trace the history of printing. Third, the rare and costly materials that are acquired in this university center are to be protected, exhibited, and used in this room.

The treasure room is a memorial to John Sevier, the first governor of Tennessee, noted pioneer, soldier, and statesman. It is a gift of Colonel Granville Sevier.

Important Features in the Building

Among the important features in this new building are the following: (1) The entire building is equipped for air conditioning. This will be a great aid to the preservation of paper and print and will add greatly to the comfort of the users of the library. (2) To make reading and research work rooms as quiet as possible, all ceilings in reading rooms and corridors are acoustically treated with celotex, and the floors in the reserve reading room and the reference room, where traffic is heavy, are of rubber tile. (3) The lighting in most of the reading rooms is fluorescent. The standard of illumination set was an average of twenty-five to thirty foot-candles. (4) The reading room chairs incorporate basic posture principles, and the table tops are sloped to add to the comfort of the reader and to break the angle of reflection. All table tops are of masonite, which provides a hard surface for writing and a full finish to prevent glare. (5) To improve the light in reading rooms, a glass window area equal to 20 per cent of the floor area was adopted. Also the wood trim throughout the building is of red gum left in its natural color to hold down the absorption of light. It is treated with wax. (6) An audio-visual department is provided. It contains three rooms for the enjoyment of victrola records with facilities for the use of sound films and possibly radio reception. It is hoped that a central joint collection of audio-visual materials, especially of educational films, can be added as aids to instruction.

So much for the program of the Joint University Libraries insofar as it has been translated into (1) an operating plan covering ownership and an executive and administrative organization; and (2) a beautiful new building adapted, we hope, to the future needs of this educational center. But let me remind you that those represent only two of the essentials in providing adequate library service for higher education and research. There are others which are equally important. These are (1) such resources of books and periodicals as will support the teach-

ing, research, and public service program of this university center; (2) a staff made competent through appropriate academic and technical training and experience; (3) an effective organization of materials for ready and intelligent use, and (4) such an integration of library resources and services with teaching, research, and public service efforts as will make of the library an implement and not a mere adjunct in this university center. The attainment of these essentials obviously implies stable and adequate financial support.

Book and Periodical Resources

With reference to book and periodical resources, the Joint University Libraries now have four hundred and eight thousand volumes. That means they rank twenty-eighth measured by volumes among the college and university library centers of America. But due to the lack of coordination in the acquisition programs of the three institutions prior to the arrival of the Joint University Libraries there was considerable duplication among the libraries of the three schools.

One of our great difficulties in the matter of book resources is that we are getting a late start. Of the dozen American university centers with more than a million volumes, none is in the South. In fact, Harvard alone, which has been at the building of a library for more than three centuries, with four and a quarter million volumes, has more books than the fifteen largest Southern university libraries combined.

In the matter of developing a suitable library staff the problems of Southern university centers are much like those in other centers—although more acute. Personnel requirements in large college and university libraries are definitely in transition. Everywhere there is greater emphasis upon having a staff with better academic and technical training than was required in the past. It is a pleasure to report progress in the development of a suitable staff by making it possible for a part of the staff to take additional academic and technical training, but more needs to be done to develop a personnel policy.

In the matter of a more efficient organization of materials, progress has been made in the improvement of the cataloging and classification of collections that have been transferred to the new building. A collection of almost thirty thousand volumes in religion that was only partially cataloged has been completely processed. But our efforts thus far are only a beginning. Our problems in achieving a more effective organization of materials are how to hold processing costs down and how best to organize materials for effective use.

Integration of Resources and Services

The integration of library resources and services with the teaching, research, and public service programs of a university center is primarily a faculty problem. On the library side there needs to be a staff in acquisition to obtain those materials that have teaching and research value and in circulation, reference, and cataloging there must be a staff, not merely concerned with good housekeeping and the technical aspects of handling books but concerned with making books and periodicals count in teaching and research. Ultimately, however, integration depends upon the faculties. Only insofar as they keep abreast of new books issued in their specialty and recommend them for purchase can a university library build the most worth-whole collections. Only insofar as

they choose to teach with library materials rather than student-bought textbooks will progress be made in teaching with books. Moreover, only insofar as they use the collections for research and public service can those collections become useful in the solution of baffling educational, social, economic, and political problems.

In conclusion, may I personally and on behalf of the board of library trustees and the staff of the Joint University Libraries express our deep appreciation to those who have helped with their moral and financial support to make the Joint University Library a reality. You have enabled us to take the first important step to provide an adequate library and with your further assistance and encouragement we hope we may take the other essential steps.

Librarians and the War

(Continued from page 100)

enabling the decisions of the American people to be based on the intellect rather than on the emotions. We don't want to repeat the mistakes of the last world war and the peace which followed it.

Let us then as a united group devote our attention for the duration to the education and enlightenment of the American people, first for victory and then for world-wide understanding with no thought of destruction or revenge.

Let us all work for victory and permanent security for all nations. This is something more than a fight for you first, or me first, or America first. It must be for the well-being of all peoples of the world. This is indeed the basic doctrine of democracy and of the Christian religion as opposed to the philosophy that one nation or one race must dominate. In the world of tomorrow no nation can secure the well-being of its own people without regard for the needs of other peoples.

Libraries and the Long Haul

(Continued from page 101)

edge is not to flicker and burn dim for decades, institutions of higher learning and their libraries must be prepared to carry on activities of basic research by continuing to an appropriate degree their normal functions.

Problems of both kinds must be met by libraries under conditions of peculiar difficulty. Library personnel is diminishing by induction into the armed services, by attraction to defense work, and through the current reduction and future extinction of N.Y.A. and W.P.A., and, more seriously, by the lowering of income. The availability of essential library supplies is becoming increasingly less. Humble examples are the increasing costs and ultimate shortage of catalog card stock and shortages in the essential materials for binding. Important publications for research published in foreign countries are generally unavailable in this country for many reasons. Only by hard work and ingenuity can we meet the current and pressing demands and at the same time keep our houses in order for the future. It will be a long haul but we are going to make it!

Scholarly Libraries and the New Cataloging Rules

THE following four papers were presented at a joint meeting of the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification and the Association of College and Reference Libraries, December 29, 1941.

By LUCILE M. MORSCH

The New Edition of the A.L.A. Catalog Rules

Miss Morsch is chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, Library of Congress.

To represent the catalogers of the country in a consideration of the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules,* preliminary American second edition, is a tremendous order, first because their needs vary so greatly and second because it has not been possible to get the opinions from many types of libraries. I am assuming, however, that, because I represent also the Library of Congress whose printed catalog cards are widely used by all types of libraries and whose practices are in general those of the A.L.A. catalog rules, what is satisfactory for the Library of Congress should be, for the most part, satisfactory for other libraries. I have, however, attended a number of meetings of catalogers discussing the rules and a few weeks ago sat for two days with representatives of several of our largest libraries to obtain their opinions on part two of the new edition.

Permit me to stress the fact that we are discussing not a new set of rules nor a set of new rules, but rather a new edition of the rules of 1908. This is a very important factor in the discussion because it makes clear that the Catalog Code Revision Committee has not proposed any substantial changes in our practice. It has been perhaps too conscious of the cost of recataloging to recommend many changes even when it saw that some might be desirable. Instead its chief contribution has been to expand the rules of 1908 to make them more intelligible, a little less open to various interpretations. This has been done by elaborating the rules and by illustrating them with many examples. There are, to be sure, some new rules to cover material not specifically mentioned in the original rules, as for example the rules to cover the entry for adaptations, dramatizations, and parodies. But these are merely statements of present practice and the result of demonstrated needs rather than theoretical expansions concocted in the minds of the committee. In fact, in the words of the chairman, "Rulings have not been attempted for cases which seemed of an exceptional character, nor when there was insufficient precedent or an insufficient number of examples as a basis for codification."[1]

[1] *A.L.A. Catalog Rules.* Preliminary American second edition. Chicago, A.L.A., 1941, p. xiv.

Uniformity of Entry

In the opinion of the catalogers this is one of the chief failings of the new edition. It does not go far enough in covering the various types of material which we have to handle from day to day. We *must* have uniformity of entry if we are to succeed in any cooperative work. For uniformity is essential to effective interchange and cooperation. In these days of challenging the form of our catalogs, when some critics of the catalog are advising the omission of subject entries and the reliance instead on subject bibliographies, others the omission of title entries, still others the separation of the catalog into its various component parts, there is only one entry on which everyone apparently agrees and that is the author or main entry. Even the most radical advocates of the catalog as a mere finding list instead of the great bibliographical tool we have been developing for half a century have not suggested that we need not make an entry for the person, personal or corporate, responsible for the work.

If, then, we are to succeed in any cooperative work—not only the extension of the use of Library of Congress or other printed cards but cooperative book use—we must have standardization of entries. In a recent statement on the use of the national union catalog to decrease descriptive cataloging costs,[2] George A. Schwegmann, Jr., its director, stressed the need for standardization of entries by strict adherence to the new *A.L.A. Catalog Rules,* or a modification of them. Only such standardization can keep a catalog of eleven million entries from chaos without expensive and not always effective editing of entries received.

[2] Letter of Dec. 11, 1941, to Jens Nyholm, assistant librarian, University of California Library, Berkeley.

Not Far Enough in Scope

I have said that the *Rules* do not go far enough in scope, that we cannot leave to the judgment of individual catalogers, regardless of the quality of that judgment, a choice of several entries in the many cases of material not covered by the *Rules* and which we are handling from day to day. Let me illustrate with a few examples.

How would you enter the name of a radio program which might be the author as well as the subject of a book? Under its own name? Under its sponsor? Under the writer of the script, if known?

How would you enter a radio station? Under place? Under its own name? Under its owner? Under some arbitrary form heading such as we use: New York. Radio Station WNYC. WNYC is a municipal station. Should it be considered an official body?

How would you enter the scenario of a motion picture based on a novel, such as *Grapes of Wrath*? Under its author, if you could ferret it out? Under the author of the novel? Under the title?

How would you enter publications of a government in exile? If the seat of the government is in territory occupied by another government and publications are issued from two sources both claiming to be official publications of the government, some means must be found to distinguish between them. For example, the government of Holland headed by Queen Wilhelmina is in England where it continues to issue acts of government printed in the official gazette, appearing in London. In addition, publications from the occupied territory of the Netherlands are also being issued. Does the official recognition of one of these bodies by our government affect its entry?

In November 1937 President Vargas of Brazil divested all the governors, except one, of the twenty states which comprise the United States of Brazil of their offices and reappointed them (or others) as federal interventors.[3] How would you enter the reports of these federal interventors? Are they to be entered under Brazil or under their respective states?

The case of Brazil is simply one example of a large class of material not covered in the *Rules*—publications of officers appointed by a government body for the administration or control of a subordinate government—and should not have a special rule limited to this specific case. In fact, throughout the new edition there are numerous specific rules which should be reduced to examples to illustrate rules more broadly stated. The principles on which they are based should be included as a part of each rule to guide the cataloger in new types of cases.

Rules Never Complete

But even broad rules, with the principles on which they are based, can never be frozen, can never be complete. The examples I have mentioned of radio programs, radio stations, motion picture scenarios, governments in exile, are problems of a changing world which the catalogers before 1908 had not known. New editions should be brought out much more frequently than they have been and some means should be found, either as supplements or through a column in one of the library journals to keep them entirely up to date. Should the Library of Congress assume the responsibility of publishing its cataloging decisions as they are made[4] another channel might be unnecessary, but a still better plan might be for the A.L.A. Division of Cataloging and Classification to appoint a standing committee on catalog rules, which would serve in an advisory capacity in the formulation, dissemination, and interpretation of new rules, and the publication of new editions as often as additions and revisions make them necessary. Obviously each edition will be larger than its predecessor, and for that reason will be more valuable as an aid in the standardization of entries and as a tool to reduce the cost of cataloging by eliminating hours spent on correspondence, in discussion, and in seeking precedents.

If this is true, what is all the excitement about this new edition which has resulted in the statement in it that "Concerning the rules . . . there has been considerable disagreement as between some catalogers and some administrators. The latter are inclined to believe that there is too much elaboration and that the expense involved in following these rules in many cases will be unjustified. A special committee of administrators and catalogers has been appointed to consider this view and has been asked to report its conclusion as soon as possible."[5]

I hope that this concern is limited entirely to the elaboration of the code in part two which deals with the physical description of the books: the transcription of the title, the imprint, collation, and notes, because most of the leading catalogers with whom I have discussed the rules agree that this is where considerable simplification is in order. I, for one, think that part two should not be published at all, that standardization of practice in details beyond the entry is not worth the cost and is not even desirable

[3] *Statesman's Yearbook*, 1940, p. 735.
[4] Proposed in an open letter to the chief of the Catalog Division, Library of Congress. *Library Journal* 64: 434, June 1, 1939.
[5] *A.L.A. Catalog Rules, op. cit.*, p. ii.

if our largest libraries require the detail of present practice. In this I am not representing most catalogers because they have been brought up to feel that the Library of Congress way is the correct way and that if no rule is in print to tell them what that way is they must determine it by precedent, or, lacking that, they must write to the Library of Congress for advice. It is a fact that we receive letters asking about punctuation of titles and details of collation. One order for cards within the last year was referred to us from the Card Division because it read: "Qualified order. Send only if revised to three dot author's name at beginning of title," and another asked for an explanation of a case of a period being placed outside quotation marks. Another library reported that on page seventy-seven of a given book there was a diagram omitted from the collation of the L.C. printed card. These are all examples of what Dr. Osborn has called legalistic cataloging. They are not, however, in any way due to the elaborateness of the rules. Every good press has its style manual and attempts to follow it as consistently as possible. The Library of Congress in printing its cards also attempts a reasonable degree of consistency in these matters of style. It is not practical, however, for any other library to accept it except in principle. In the 1908 edition of the *Rules* the Library of Congress practice in many cases was stated as a supplementary rule. Unfortunately in the new edition only the Library of Congress practice is described, which implies that it is the ideal method for any library. Inasmuch as standardization in details of description is of doubtful value, why should the American Library Association publish part two of the new edition and thereby set up a dictatorial code? Instead the Library of Congress should publish a style manual describing its practice and be responsible for keeping it reasonably up to date. Other libraries could use it so far as it met their needs but would recognize it as the practice of the Library of Congress only and have no fear that if they violated it in any way their libraries would not have the stamp of approval of the American Library Association.

Needs Being Studied

In fact the Library of Congress itself is at present studying the relationship of its descriptive cataloging to the needs of the library and the needs of other libraries using its printed cards. Simplifications must be based on the minimum essentials of the needs of the Library of Congress and what those needs are must be determined by the reference and searching staffs. If the simple abbreviation "illus." is adequate description of the illustrative matter in a book containing portraits, maps, facsimiles, and diagrams, the catalogers will gladly omit the more elaborate description now supplied. But it is definitely up to the departments for whom the catalog is made and who work with the public for which it is made, to decide which details, if any, can be omitted. The catalogers can go no further than to challenge the needs and urge cooperation in seeking possible simplifications.

Questions of the fulness of bibliographical description and the number of entries to be made for a book are matters which should vary in libraries according to the purposes of the institutions, the nature of the collections, and the use to be made of the catalog. They cannot be decided for all libraries either by the A.L.A. or the Library of Congress. For many years

administrators have been leaving these problems to the catalogers. Suddenly they have realized their own responsibilities in this field—responsibilities of making major policies of far-spreading effects—which cannot be delegated to a single department. Along with this realization has come a terrifying feeling of inadequacy because the problems are staggering in their proportions and the administrators have lost the contacts necessary to their solution. They are having to rely very largely on the advice and experience of those "technicians" whom a few alarmists have urged them to distrust. Hence the recent great concern on the part of some library administrators. If there is a crisis in cataloging it is not a general crisis closely associated with and attributable to the publication of the new edition of the *Rules* but an individual problem to be faced courageously at home.

By FLORA B. LUDINGTON

The New Code and the College Library

Miss Ludington is librarian, Williston Memorial Library, Mount Holyoke College.

Library administrators, in the last few months, have been going to school to the catalogers. The classes have been analagous to those in the medical profession known as refresher courses. Their success has been in proportion to the knowledge and interest of the administrator. I have been attending such a seminar, and for much that follows I am indebted to the catalogers of the Mount Holyoke College library who were my teachers. These discussions served to sharpen my realization of cataloging minutiæ and of changes that have crept into its procedures in the years since I profited by the teaching of Jennie Dorcas Fellows. In spite of Dr. Bishop's warning that I should never try to do reference work without having had cataloging experience, I did serve as a reference librarian for a number of years. My administrative experience is of shorter duration, but in the past few years I have become sharply aware of the administrative problems related to cataloging. These problems all relate to making material promptly and readily available and the costs in so doing. The library catalog, key to the accessibility of this material, is newly related to these problems in the light of the revised code of cataloging.

This preliminary American second edition very largely codifies existing practice. It arranges in a form which is readily consulted cataloging procedures of the Library of Congress developed in the past forty years. Needless to say, they have changed during this period. They have changed since the 1908 code was published and they will continue to change. Aside from the need to codify Library of Congress practice, it was especially desirable to clarify many points for libraries doing cooperative cataloging and for those listing their holdings in union catalogs. The

new code is a finely comprehensive piece of work. It provides for practically every contingency as a court of appeal in every type of cataloging. It has definite value in codifying rules which Mount Holyoke, for one, has been trying to work out for itself through study of Library of Congress rules and their application to its cards. The time spent in cataloging should be reduced, for by having definite rules in a manual and by accepting such rules as authoritative, unnecessary discussion and indecision can be avoided. The committee has done a distinct service to the profession in making the material in the new code available for consultation. Judgment and discrimination will still be needed in the application of the rules and in adapting them for use in a particular situation.

Dependent upon L.C. Cards

During the years that the Library of Congress has been making its cards available, all libraries have become increasingly dependent upon these printed cards. Mount Holyoke was the eighth library to avail itself of the new service which was established forty years ago this month. During the first year, out of 7035 cards filed in the catalog 3½ per cent were printed Library of Congress cards. In the last year for which figures are available (1936-37) out of 14,400 cards filed, they had risen to 70 per cent. The percentage has increased not only because more cards were issued, but also because by using them, a more satisfactory and uniform catalog would result and at a cost which would be less than if we were to do all the work ourselves. Naturally the percentage of Library of Congress cards used is lower for the universities because of wider curricular spread and a larger proportion of foreign titles. But both college and university libraries would welcome a further increase in this percentage.

How can this be done? First, by speeding up and streamlining Library of Congress cataloging and the issuing of printed cards. Progress in this regard is already apparent, but books reported as having been received in January 1939 are still being held in December 1941. Titles reported as "on" (books ordered in North America, cards can be expected in twelve weeks) often wait for months.

Second, as we are well aware, the Library of Congress needs to catch up in its arrearage. Ample evidence of this can be found by examination of titles reported as "R" (book has been received, cards may be expected in seven weeks) and of still older vintage are those reported as "Rd" (book received, cataloging delayed, perhaps a year) and "Rdl" (book received, but cataloging will be delayed a long time, possibly five years). In these latter categories can be found such titles, important to college and university libraries, as Lüdtke's *Deutscher Kulturatlas* (waiting since 1935), Furtwängler's *Griechische Vasenmälerei* (since 1937), over twenty volumes issued for the International Geological Congress held in Leningrad in 1937, etc. These are all titles which will be found in many college and university libraries. As things stand, many of us are handling these items for ourselves.

Budget for Noncopyright Books

Third, still another way to increase the use of printed cards would be the provision of a more generous budget for the Library of Congress itself for noncopyright books, largely ones published in

England and outside the United States. New English titles are now being included in cooperative cataloging and cards are thus made available, but many an "np" book is one which should be found in our national library.

Fourth, prompt reporting to the union catalog for all items reported by the Library of Congress as "np," or not printed, should be incumbent on all of us and as a corollary a provision for automatic searching in the union catalog for all titles lacking in the Library of Congress depository. This service is, I believe, now available to libraries doing cooperative cataloging. I wish it might be extended to all libraries, and that the formulae for Library of Congress card orders could be changed so that libraries electing the service could have all "np" titles automatically searched and a report made of other libraries that had already cataloged the volumes. Photostatic copies of the cards could then be secured from those libraries.

One further point before I leave the subject of the Library of Congress and its cataloging, and that is the very great desirability of the printing of the Library of Congress depository catalog at the earliest possible date. This would help all of us to establish author entries and in deciding the number of cards to order when older titles are being handled. Keeping the catalog up to date is still another matter which will engage the A.L.A. committee concerned with the project.

You may very well ask what bearing have these observations of the Library of Congress card service on the new cataloging code. My categorical answer is, a great deal indeed. The code which we now have before us is a record of past Library of Congress practices which have resulted in vast arrearage in cataloging in our great national library. It has resulted in provoking serious delay in issuing cards for books which are now in Washington waiting cataloging for weeks, months, and even years. If this arrearage is to continue to snowball, then something must be done about it. The Descriptive Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress is already pointing the way; we as college librarians should give it our support. The intelligent leadership which has long been the tradition of the Library of Congress, as evidenced by the publication of the first printed cards, is again to the fore. In advocating changes which, at first glance, may seem to be radical but which retain the essential features of good cataloging practice, the Library of Congress promises to be in a position to accelerate its service to our libraries, large and small, popular and scholarly alike.

New Code Based on Established Practice

At this point let us examine the new code, which is based on established practice, and see what portions of it warrant retention by the Library of Congress and what portions can be modified in the interests of economy and efficiency of the card service.

The committee was most wise in its decision to issue the code in two parts. This was logical not only for ease of consultation but also for the possibility of simplification. Part 1 of the code is very properly legalistic in its approach to the problem of main entries. By codifying already established rules, the committee has been scholarly in its grasp and solution of problems. It is here that there should be a fair degree of uniformity, not only in a single library but among libraries in gen-

eral. With the increase of union catalogs this is of primary importance for if filing problems are not solved at their source by adequate and accurate entries, the cost is simply passed on to another agency.

There are, however, special classes of entries which merit comment. The first of these is the perplexing problem of the corporate entry. Here the rules are hard to follow and occasionally tend to pass over the sound bibliographical principle of describing the physical object in hand. In our, perhaps commendable, zeal to bring all entries of an issuing agency together, we frequently force the users of our catalogs to shuttle back and forth from one section of the alphabet to another and to cope with drawers of cards listing publications of a single governmental agency or a learned society. The human mind and memory are so constituted that a book is most apt to be remembered by subject or according to information found on the title page. Would stricter adherence to the data given on the title pages of these books help to break up the long files which will continue to result from our present practice? Books issued by societies or governmental agencies are notoriously difficult to locate. The problems involved are not easy of solution. J. C. M. Hanson has stated the difficulties more clearly than I can in his article "Corporate Authorship versus Title Entry."[1] In this article Mr. Hanson records his doubt concerning practices which have been followed for forty years and makes a number of concrete suggestions. The new rules boldly attack many of the problems involved; they will help to solve some of them, but it is my belief that further thought and study are indicated. For example, the rules (no. 71-102) do not state which authorities to prefer in establishing the headings if there is a conflict among those consulted. On the authority card used as an illustration in Appendix V (p. 340) we find an entry for Massachusetts. "Special Commission on Security Laws." (Created by Chapter 37 of the Resolves of 1937.) Cross references are given from two other possible forms and from the title page wording "Massachusetts special commission on *study* of laws regulating promotion and sale of securities." Not one of these wordings actually appears in Chapter 37 of the Resolves of 1937, though the title page form comes close to agreeing with the entry selected. It is evident from a study of the wording of a number of resolves creating commissions that a simplified wording has to be adopted for the author entry. But no special rule covers the following:

Massachusetts. *Special commission to study and revise laws relating to public welfare.*
Report. 1936. [36-27943]
T-p reads. Special commission *established* to study and revise *the* laws relating to public welfare.
Chap. 56, Resolves of 1935. Uses same wording.

Massachusetts. *Special commission to investigate the laws relative to dependent delinquent and neglected children.*
Report. 1931. [35-89]
T-p reads. Special commission *established* to investigate . . .

Massachusetts. *Special commission on public health laws and policies.*
Report. 1936. [37-27570]
T-p reads. Special commission to *study and investigate* public health . . .
Chap. 11, Resolves of 1935.
Chap. 32, Resolves of 1936.
Wording in these includes phrase *to study and investigate.*

Massachusetts. *Special commission on activities within this commonwealth of communistic, fascist, Nazi and other subversive organizations.*

[1] *Library Quarterly* 5:455-66, Oct. 1935.

Report. 1938. [32-28436]
T-p reads. Special commission *to investigate the* activities . . .
Chap. 32, Resolves of 1937 reads.
Special commission relative to the activities . . .

In some cases the words "to study," "to investigate," "to revise" have been retained, in other instances they have been dropped so it is necessary to make numerous cross references or to force the students to go through endless cards under Massachusetts. Would it not be less confusing to follow the title page form since it is most surely the one which will be used by the bibliographer citing the item in a bibliography? The code does not help us with the perplexing problem as to what to do when a new governmental agency is set up, especially if it has formerly been a division of an old one. When is a new bureau really a new entity? The Library of Congress can help us if it will explain the principles underlying its procedures in setting up main headings and subheadings.

Series Entry Rules

The rules relating to series entries may also be debated, especially the one (219c) which instructs the cataloger to "give imprint for a current series as for an open entry, and in collation line leave space for volumes but indicate size. Do not attempt to keep imprint and collation up to date as later volumes are added." (p. 216) The simpler rule in the 1908 code (no. 128) is easier to follow in that imprint and collation are omitted. Since the analytical cards which will be made under the separate volumes of the series will give the imprint and collation, would it not be possible to return to the earlier and simpler form?

Rule 220c provides for the use of the unit card for analytical entries where contents or partial contents are shown. My own experience in showing students how to use the catalog leads me to believe that the use of unit cards for analytics, especially if the volume contains a number of items and the contents note extends to a second or even a third card, is confusing. A simpler typed form will save the time of the reference department and the user of the catalog.

The rules for added entries also warrant close study. Particular attention should be paid to rule 223b5. "For all works of any character bearing a distinctive or striking title; make partial entry in cases where a subtitle, alternative title, or some striking part of the title (catchword title) is likely to be remembered, but prefer a subject heading, or a reference to a subject heading, where the title heading would be the same." (p. 232) Use of title entries should be avoided as much as possible for nondistinctive titles beginning with "One act plays," "Essays of," "Life of," "Short history of," "Principles of," "Textbook on," "Outline of," etc. This quoted rule is of such great importance that I wish some telling examples had been given.

Another point can be made in regard to serials which through the vicissitudes of time and editorships have changed their titles. Our practice is to enter under the latest form of the title, even though it may represent the last desperate act of an editor who hopes to revive a waning journal. The result is that a student armed with an *Education Index* reference to the *Social Frontier* is sent to the drawer containing the card for *Frontiers of Democracy*. How many of you using the old *Poole's Index* have been confused by *Scribners Monthly* (1870-81)? From *Scribners* you were sent to the *Century Illustrated Monthly Maga-*

zine from 1881 to 1930 when *Century* merged with *The Forum*. Would it not be less wasteful of the patron's time if he were given the call number and the library's holdings as to date and volumes on each card with a reference to the latest entry for the full genealogy of the journal?

While still speaking of serials, I have a suggestion to make to the committee. I wish they would consider drawing together all of the rules for serials, noting particular instances where notes relating to editors, illustrations, etc., may be simplified. I wish also that the rules for handling processed material could be drawn together, at least in the index.

Part 1 of the code is concerned with forms of entries and headings. It represents careful and scholarly work. It deserves our endorsement and our pledge to conform to it.

Description of the Book

Part 2 of the code is devoted to the description of the book. The committee warns us that "From the rules in Part 2, however, it is expected that there may be variation in practice not only in small libraries as opposed to large but in the treatment of different classes of material. . . . Close adherence to these rules is not so essential as in the case of author entry." (p. xiii) This statement should not be overlooked or forgotten. Every library will have at least a few rare books and a few special collections the cataloging of which will involve close application of the rules in Part 2 of the code. Unique material in our own college or local history collections should be carefully and meticulously described. It is my hope that Part 2 of the code will be retained and followed in describing special collections. On the other hand, the bulk of our materials, books purchased for curricular use by undergraduate students, can be described in less detail and still be effective educational tools.

That the Library of Congress is aware of the possibilities of simplification is shown by the revision of its rules now being undertaken and of which Miss Morsch, the chief of its Descriptive Cataloging Division, has told us. It is my hope that in setting up its new manual the Library of Congress will continue its detailed cataloging for rare and unusual items, not only books that will be considered rare by the Library of Congress but also those which may seem to be of intermediate value but which to the college library will certainly border on rarity. If the Library of Congress seeks advice as to the course it should take, I trust that it will include on its committee not only representatives of the larger libraries but also of the 823 college and university libraries with less than two thousand students that subscribe to its card service.

Simplifications

Certain simplifications seem practical for many items of imprint, collation, and notes. The first place of publication and the first publisher is usually enough to identify an item. I doubt if the extended forms are often needed even in the large library. My own instinct is to translate all dates of publication into arabic figures. If the book is an early one, say before 1600 for European books and 1800 for American ones, and the title page date given in Roman numerals, could that not be recognized in a note thus informing the unusual student but clarifying for others.

The physical book is not static, it changes with use and rebinding. Collation rules which give directions for record-

ing preliminary leaves and end paper maps, exact size to one half centimeter, etc., should be given for rare books and limited editions but are not essential for the ordinary trade book which will be read and worn out at least to the extent of rebinding. When rebound the preliminary leaves will disappear and the actual size will change. The chief concern of students and faculty members is with the intellectual book, i.e., the text and the illustrative material which amplifies and explains the text. It is sufficient to give the numbered pages, for the introduction, prefaces, and text proper. If, however, an introduction or preface extends over two or three pages and is not numbered, it should be counted and noted. Information regarding illustrations should be retained but not necessarily in detail. The rule (304) to "separate the illustrative material included in the paging from that not included by a period and a perceptively longer space than is used after a comma" (p. 289) adds little if anything to the value of the catalog or to faculty members' respect for our scholarship.

Notes

As to notes, which are rarely read by students, there are some which are valuable and which would be more apt to be noticed if we indulged ourselves in fewer of them. The bibliography note is one which should always be given especially if reference can be made to specific pages.

Faculty members are not appreciative of our zeal in recording title pages with decorative borders, title page vignettes, or title in black and red and "at the head of title" notes. The merit of the first edition note can be debated. Many publishers of trade books are indicating edition or printing by use of symbols. The phrase "first edition" by no means guarantees the first issue of the first edition, the one which is valued by the collector. My own instinct is to omit the first edition note unless the edition is a limited one but retain the note for later editions. When it is possible to describe a book accurately on a single card, this should be done. By reducing the collation and notes without loss of meaning, we would be avoiding cards containing continued stories that are rarely read!

The appendices contain much that is valuable and worth while. This is especially true of the rules for incunabula (though they do not follow the injunction given in rule 229 to indicate line endings). The rules for handling music are concise and helpful. The note regarding conventional or standard titles of music should have been emphasized by examples as is done in the Music Library Association *Code for Cataloging Music* (p. 371). The rules for capitalization go back to those established by Cutter, but it is still hard to explain why we capitalize Scotland Yard because it has lost its original meaning but do not capitalize the H in White house! With the present complicated rules, more time is spent in deciding whether to capitalize or not than would be spent in typing capital letters. True, we may gain in consistency but the filing is the same whatever we do. Would it not be easier in the long run if all names of buildings, government offices and officers, geographic names, and titles of honor, whether before or after a name were capitalized in full?

What Do We Want for Our Catalogs?

If time permitted, there are other details in the code which might be mentioned, but the trend of my thinking has been indicated. This is the time when we might well ask ourselves what do we want

for our catalogs? The catalog in its simplest form is an author list of materials. But in order to make the knowledge contained in our books more readily accessible, we in America developed classed and dictionary catalogs. In this way we created bibliographical tools which our patrons are now taking for granted and in all probability will continue to demand. The catalogs in our largest libraries have reached terrifying proportions, so great that some libraries have divided their catalogs in order to break up the huge files. Do we want more added entries and more analytics or would the greater alphabets created by this extension only confound our faculty members and students? Are the details of collation represented in forty-two new rules all essential ones? Are they essential to the great bulk of our collections or can we restrict bibliographical description to our special collections, rare and semirare items? That some libraries are willing to dispense with certain details can be deduced from the fact that 181 college and university libraries are using the H. W. Wilson cards. These cards are exceedingly simple and direct, possibly too simple, but they are restricted to the somewhat popular titles represented in the *Standard Catalog*.

Several Paths Open

Several paths are open to the committee sponsoring the new code. My belief is that the first part should be retained with slight modification. Ways and means by which the injunction given in the preface to modify and simplify can be carried out could be indicated by illustration. This might be done either by examples in the text, differentiating them typographically or by issuing a supplementary style manual. In making available to the cataloger the scholarly and detailed fashion by which books may be described, we have at last a comprehensive and effective manual. There are few, if any, rules that will not be used and valued by some library. Let us not pass over them hastily or in the interests of what may now seem to be economy. If we simplify too much, the pendulum will surely swing in the other direction later, and the costs which we should be shouldering now will be passed on to those who will follow us.

By MARGARET I. SMITH

The Code and the University Reference Librarian

Miss Smith is superintendent of the reading room, General Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

I might confess at the beginning that this is the first cataloging code that I have ever read straight through. I found it more interesting than I anticipated and I was so impressed with the wealth of reference material it contains that I am going to speak first of the code as a reference book in itself. It has been said many times before that the catalog is the reference librarian's most important tool but I think

now that the code is a very important supplement to it and that a copy should be on hand at every reference desk.

Reference Uses of Code

It can be used in two ways: (1) To explain to a baffled user of the catalog some obscure entry. For instance, the entries for some parts of the church liturgies, as the Ambrosian rite, are frequently questioned. There in the code is a clear and concise outline of the liturgies of the Catholic and Eastern churches. Upon showing this and the many examples of entries of the liturgies to the inquirer, the entry seems more reasonable. Even the fact that the Home Owners Loan Corporation is entered under *Home* while the Rural Electrification Administration is under *U.S.* Rural Electrification Administration seemed clear to an inquirer when I showed him the explanation in the code and the examples for the difference. (2) Another reference use of the code is for the information which it contains in itself. The glossary is useful for students who are compiling bibliographies. I recently found the definition of the term "broadside" very satisfactory.

The outline of the masonic organization is a fine piece of reference work. The sections on foreign compound names and the explanation of the make-up of a Hungarian married woman's name are worth remembering. The transliteration tables are useful. Frequently the sources of the information are given and thus further detail may be located.

I might enumerate many more such examples but I must go on to the second consideration of the code from the reference point of view, i.e., "What do the users of the catalog in a university library want from the catalog card?"

For libraries already using the complete Library of Congress cards, the code does not change things in any appreciable degree, but before accepting the code it may be well to consider whether the entries advocated and whether all the details now put upon the cards by the catalogers are wanted by the user of the catalog. No adequate study has yet been made of this rather intangible question but it probably should be made. I can only give impressions gained from long experience and some instances which have occurred in the last two months. My impression is that every bit of information on the catalog card is used at some time and I believe that a close study would prove that the time saved for faculty, students, reference and order departments more than compensates for the time the catalogers take in looking up the information and putting it on the card once and for all time. It is true that some information and some cards are seldom used but other information is used with great regularity. In that large group of students and faculty who crowd around the catalog at all times, there are many who are just using it as a finding list, but I think there are always a few who are looking for a diagram, a facsimile, a very special edition of an author's works, or in some way using the detailed and so-called reference material. Also in a university library one never knows when a scholar who knows more about a subject than anyone else in the world is going to appear at the catalog and make use of some fine point.

Since I realize that some shortening of the cataloging may be necessary in some cases, I will speak first of the parts I should like to see continued at all costs and then some parts I should be willing to see curtailed if necessary.

Author Entry

1. Author entry. In this day of union catalogs, cooperative catalogs, and interlibrary loan, it is necessary that all cooperating libraries keep their main entries in agreement as much as possible. A book cataloged under an unusual entry is as good as lost in a union catalog. With the expanded rules and the many examples given in the code, it should be easier for libraries to keep their entries consistent. The examples given under corporate entries seem especially apt.

In a university library, for the personal author entry, we need, in most cases, the author's full name and his dates. Aside from its purpose of distinguishing persons of the same name for filing and entry, the purpose of dates is largely for reference use. However, I believe this is one kind of reference information on the card that is used by all kinds of users of the catalog —undergraduates, research workers, faculty, reference, order, and catalog departments. For speed in use and for accuracy, the information on the catalog cards surpasses all biographical dictionaries. If more information is desired, it is easier from this information to locate the right biographical dictionary or an obituary. I am frequently impressed with the accuracy of the dates on the Library of Congress cards. Recently a member of our faculty was looking for the birth date of Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne. The Library of Congress cards gave one date but several biographical dictionaries were consulted and a life of Mrs. Hawthorne by her son gave a date two years later. We then began an extensive search in the vital records of Massachusetts, in the printed church records, and obituary notices and found that the date in these sources agreed with the date on the Library of Congress cards. If it had not been for the Library of Congress cards we would have used the date used by her son and thus perpetuated the mistake. I am wondering where the cataloger at the Library of Congress found her information and how much time she took with the question. However much, I am grateful to her!

An edition printed after an author's death sometimes leads the reader astray if the author's dates are not given. I once heard a reader say he always looked at the author's dates on a card when getting a book because he was interested to see how old the author was when he wrote the book.

The rule in the code now reads "add the dates of birth and death in the heading when they can be discovered with a reasonable amount of search." I should like to see the interpretation of this rule stretched to the limit in many cases. It is true that the information might be found easily in some new reference book ten years hence but think of the number of people who are going to search through volume after volume of *Who's Who* in the meantime.

Added Entries

2. Added entries. This section in the code has been expanded but I believe it could be expanded still more. To me added entries are more important than the subject cards. A book is quoted by the name of its editor, joint author, illustrator, translator, by its title, partial title, the body sponsoring its publication—anything the reader or writer can remember offhand, and often the subject cannot be definitely determined from the fragmentary reference. Our order department has found that books are so often offered in dealer's catalogs, not by the name used in our main entry but by some added entry, that many added en-

tries are now put in the official catalog for their benefit.

Analytical Entry

3. The analytical entry. The value of the analytic card in any library varies with the ease with which the information may be found elsewhere in that library. Sometimes a set is well analyzed in a bibliography, an index, or the publisher's catalog, and it is not necessary to duplicate the work. Other times these analytical entries are priceless. I am reminded of a recent search for a memorial lecture which was hidden in a set which was privately printed. We are frequently able to locate, through a Library of Congress analytic, a book in our own library in a set not analyzed in our catalog. Offhand I should say that the code gives the form for every possible kind of an analytical entry but the question of what to analyze must be settled by each library. I believe this is a question that might be settled by the catalog department after consultation with the reference department.

Description of the Book

4. Part 2 of the code is devoted to the description of the book—the transcription of the title, the imprint, the collation, the size. All of these rules have been expanded and the examples cover many complicated pagings and exceptional imprints. Individual libraries may adopt as many or as few of the rules as they wish, but no doubt it will save time for all catalogers to have this more or less routine part of the work so definitely laid out. For a university library, I believe most of the details described are both useful and necessary.

It is true an undergraduate needs only the simple pagination when he is looking for some book which is not too long or when he is required to read three hundred pages on some subject. On the other hand the detailed pagination is necessary in identifying the book as the one quoted in a bibliography or in differentiating editions. Recently one of our faculty members wished to consult all the editions and issues of the works of Mme. de Staël for the sake of comparing the change in public attitude towards certain passages. We found that several editions were printed the same year and differed only slightly in paging but through the detailed pagination found on our depository cards and the cards in the union catalog of the Library of Congress we were able to borrow for him on interlibrary loan almost every known edition or issue. I speak of this instance because it was not a question of rare books, and it was the contents and not the bibliography which interested the reader.

Of course the detailed pagination on the Library of Congress or some other equally detailed card is frequently invaluable for the comparison of our copy of the book with another copy. With the detailed pagination given for single volumes, it is disappointing to see in this code that the same rule stands concerning the omission of the pagination of works of more than one volume. For identification, for interlibrary loan, for microfilming, for an idea of how completely a subject is covered, we need this information as much for works of two volumes as we do for works of one volume.

Collation

The section on the collation of illustrations, plates, portraits, facsimiles is very detailed—too detailed for many libraries no doubt. However, I believe all of this information is used and saves time in a uni-

versity library. It is much quicker to find a facsimile of a page of Beowulf in the Anglo-Saxon from the card catalog than it is to go through three shelves of copies of Beowulf to find such an edition. Usually a reader does not care if the map, portrait, or diagram he is looking for is a frontispiece or not, but since the term "frontispiece" helps to identify the book or the edition, this information might as well be included.

All of this detailed description is used constantly by the order department for it is only through a careful comparison of the paging, size, illustrations, etc., that they can be sure the edition offered for sale in a dealer's catalog is not one already in the library, or the copy they buy is complete. So-called new editions often turn out to be not so new when a comparison of the collations is made.

Notes

5. Just one more point on the description of the book—this is the question of notes. Although there are many useful suggestions as to the form of the note in the code, the cataloger must decide when to make one. A little note often gives a clue which solves the whole reference problem. The note that the book has been published under another title, that it is extracted from some journal, that it was published in a limited edition, that the text is in Russian and German, or, in the case of a translation, the note which gives the original title—all these are used so frequently that we forget to be grateful to the catalogers for the information. We also find the fuller notes in the information cards very useful. I was interested to see in the code the detailed directions for an information card concerning unnumbered international or national congresses. The proceedings of these congresses are so complicated that an information card supplying the number and dates of all the congresses is a great help in convincing a reader that a seemingly broken set is complete. This information is frequently very difficult to find elsewhere, but the cataloger has run it down from many sources and recorded it once and for all.

Items to Give Up

So much for the points of the code and the catalog which a reference department of a university library likes to see emphasized. The question now arises what are we willing to give up? Some of the points I have suggested as I have gone over them, but let me enumerate.

(1) The cards which might be omitted from the catalog. (a) We do not need series cards for long series for which there are published indexes such as the publications of the Carnegie Institution, the publications of the Department of State and other government offices, or the series cards for publishers' series which are easily found in the publishers' catalogs. (b) We do not need analytic cards for sets analyzed in good bibliographies.

(2) Information which might be omitted from the card. (a) Reference librarians do not need contents notes for books indexed in the standard indexes—as the *Essay Index,* the *Short Story Index,* the *Drama Index,* or for books like Caffin's *History of American Painting* where the title indicates pretty well the contents. We *do* need contents notes for an author's collected works which has no index of its own or for composite works not indexed elsewhere. (b) We do not need to have the author's name repeated in the body of the card unless some further information is added thereby. If feasible, I should like

to see the names of both of the joint authors of a book put in the main entry and their names not repeated in the body of the card. This would be less confusing to many users of the catalog and also less irritating to the joint author, or to the joint author's friend, for so often it is the joint author who has done most of the work on the book and then finds his name relegated to the middle of the card and an added entry. However, I believe this would not save time for the cataloger who would have difficulty in finding room for this information at the top of the card or later in adding information to the main entry if additional information were found.

(c) Most libraries do not need such detailed cataloging of serials. Now that we have the *Union List of Serials* with its fund of information concerning changes of titles and indexes, we do not need all of this information repeated on the cards. There is, however, one important item on the card which is not in the *Union List*—that is, the names and dates of the editors and I hope the catalog will continue to give this information. Frequently we need this hidden information for editors of foreign periodicals and for American periodicals published before Ayers or not listed in Ayers.

(3) The code is not concerned with subject headings, but while mentioning cataloging cuts I should like to say that I feel that a judicious omission of many of the subject cards would be the least serious of all the possible cuts in cataloging.

Brief Cataloging

(4) My last suggestion is that certain types of material be cataloged very briefly —that is, foreign dissertations, certain pamphlets and processed materials (some are probably not worth even brief cataloging), government documents which have their own indexes, and books of little consequence which just drift in. Books on subjects not pertinent to the particular library might also have a form of brief cataloging. All of this material must be sorted by a competent person with unusual judgment and it is very necessary to decide on a practical system of brief cataloging which will stand the test of time. If the work has to be done over, there is no time saved. At the university we have had several successive methods of brief cataloging for foreign dissertations. Until recently each time a foreign dissertation was wanted, we had to decide first which method was in use when the thesis was written and look for it under that method, or, more often, look for it under all methods. Our reference department is convinced that no time was saved for the library.

Full Code Be Adopted

In conclusion, for university libraries, I should like to urge that the code be adopted about as full as it is—some parts expanded and other parts changed as catalogers might agree. Especially, I should like to see the Library of Congress adopt the code, or at least keep on with the parts of it which it is now using so that no matter what other libraries do in the way of shortening the information on the card, the depository cards will give the full information. If the Library of Congress cannot keep up with this work, I feel that other large libraries should help to subsidize this work. Without this full information on our own cards or on the depository cards the work of our reference department would be seriously handicapped and would require more help to do the same work we are doing today.

By RALPH E. ELLSWORTH

The Administrative Implications for University Libraries of the New Cataloging Code

Mr. Ellsworth is director of libraries, University of Colorado, Boulder.

Now that it is my turn to level my lance at the sails of this dangerous and seemingly impregnable windmill, I wonder why I was chosen to speak for university libraries. Perhaps because someone had to be the goat and because my ignorance could be written off on the grounds of youth and innocence. Or, perhaps because Mr. Coney felt that someone who had been exposed to the chilling and biting drafts which sweep around the Chicago Graduate Library School corridors would be sufficiently tough to stand up under the rebuttal blasts which are sure to follow the approach I intend to make.

If you think that each university library should have a catalog which will aim at giving a reasonably complete bibliographic description of all its books regardless of the nature and importance of these books, the purpose for which they were bought and used, and the characteristics of the clientele using the books, if, in other words, you accept the assumptions underlying our present cataloging practices, then I think you have to take one of two attitudes toward the new code.

You may say that the wise cataloger will welcome the codification and will use it as a useful tool and not as an end in itself, or you may feel that the code will drag us deeper into that kind of perfectionistic cataloging which Dr. Osborn has described so ably.[1]

But as an administrator, I dare not accept these assumptions and I think the publication of the new code is a propitious moment for a critical analysis of them. I present the following eleven reasons for pursuing this analysis.

Reasons for Analysis

First, from the time of volume one of the *Library Journal,* there has been much critical discussion about the relation between catalogs and bibliographies, and the proponents of subject cataloging have embarked upon a program without recognizing and meeting the objections of the proponents of subject bibliographies as a substitute for subject cataloging. In fact, I have thought, after reading the literature, that the latter group were more logical, scholarly, and realistic than the first even though they were not able to organize themselves into a successful pressure group in the profession.

Second, a casual scanning of the new code with its hundreds of rules and exceptions to rules leads me to wonder how we are to expect our student bodies to comprehend such a system in a manner that will enable them to use the resulting tool. One is forced to the conclusion that our catalogs are librarians' and not users' tools.

[1] Osborn, A. D. *The Crisis in Cataloging.* American Library Institute, 1941.

Third, observation of the behavior of students leads me to the conclusion that we are aiming far over their heads. The majority seem merely interested in locating a specific book title which someone has asked or told them to read. A minority approach the catalog from the subject point of view and these aren't interested in the subject approach as we librarians think of it.

Fourth, discussion with members of the faculty, at Colorado and elsewhere, reveals that many of them do not even know what the catalog has to offer and when this is explained to them, they wonder why in the world librarians go to all this trouble to produce a tool which has so little relationship to their use of the records of scholarship.

Fifth, one of the truisms of educational psychology is that learners differ in their ability, the extent of their knowledge, and the rate at which they acquire knowledge. Yet, we offer one single tool which we assume can be used by all students and members of the faculty with equal success.

Differences in Materials

Sixth, if it can be whispered that the catalog's clientele differs in its characteristics, it can be *shouted* that the publications listed in our catalogs differ in purpose, scope, method, significance, suitability, and relevance. A bibliographic tool which ignores these differences must necessarily fall short of its aim of bringing the reader and the book together.

Seventh, every adult in this audience has lived to witness the out-moding of most of the truths which were regarded as immutable in his or her youth. In all realms of knowledge the researcher is carefully peeling off layer after layer of prejudice, ignorance, misconception, and mistaken relationships. At the same time, our knowledge is increasing at a geometric ratio and our terminology is changing as rapidly.

As an administrator, I see that we cannot afford to change our cataloging terminology fast enough to keep within sight of the front lines of research. Nor can most of us afford large enough staffs to do the reclassification which needs to be done if our subject classifications are to avoid being the laughing stock of an alert contemporary. As a librarian, I am ashamed to admit that my profession has been unable to think of a way in which these two problems can be met. I am not satisfied with the plea that we need to take the long-time point of view, because I see no indication that the rate of change will slow down. It is more likely to increase.

Eighth, as a pseudo or sometime social scientist, I know that in time of crisis, and especially in the period immediately preceding the crisis, the pamphlet and other elusive materials become of supreme importance. I see that we cannot afford to handle these materials in our regular cataloging process, and so we resort to other means of handling them. Social science scholars have been known to wonder why we don't use these "other means" more often. They seem so simple and inexpensive.

Duplication

Ninth, I see within my own state several state-supported institutions of higher learning and two private institutions all with curricula which overlap to some extent and all with book collections that duplicate one another to some extent. Each of these institutions maintains its own cataloging staff and catalogs its own books, even though a substantial share of this work is outright duplication.

And what is true of Colorado is even more true of the country as a whole.

Timid voices which have raised this question before have been smashed down with the answer that each university is different from all the rest and each one therefore has to adapt its catalogs and classifications to meet its own unique needs. Unique indeed! Some of us are wondering if our own incompetence isn't what we mean by our uniqueness.

You may say the Library of Congress card system answers my objection, but if so, can you show me a library that reduced the size of its cataloging staff after it started to use Library of Congress cards? Or, can you show me one that does not study the Library of Congress cards and alter them to such an extent that the savings are practically wiped out?

Tenth, a university exists primarily for a community of scholars. There are many in our midst that are not scholars, but even so the majority have some degree of *Wissendurst.* If the catalog is the best tool we can devise for scholars, it would seem logical that catalogers should either be scholars themselves, or at least be scholarly enough to understand the language of scholarship. Frankly, it does not seem to me that many of us have been successful in staffing our departments with large numbers of catalogers who from the point of view of education and training have reached a high enough level to produce scholarly cataloging. How many Ph.D.'s are there among our catalogers? Even if we could get such people, the salaries we pay, the academic status we offer, the working conditions we impose, and the kind of work we expect would soon drive most real scholars out of the field. We administrators are guilty of tolerating a situation when we ought to be protesting, nationally, in a manner that would lead to a different course of action.

Catalogs and Bibliographies

Eleventh, I have read the literature of the subject rather carefully, and I find that we librarians have not come to grips with the problem of the relation between catalogs and bibliographies. We have come to assume that our subject catalogs coupled with our subject classifications are subject bibliographies or can be used as substitutes for them. It is within the realm of this problem that we have strayed farthest from realities. We defend our assumptions by saying that the catalog shows what one library owns but the bibliography shows what is available elsewhere. For the beginning student, this distinction may be all right, but for the researcher, it is meaningless. For what purpose are our union lists and catalogs, our interlibrary loan services, and our microfilms, if not to enable the scholar to secure whatever he needs? In other words, for the researcher, when he uses the library as a researcher, the catalog is slightly irrelevant.

Scholars have found that our catalogs do not reveal the literature they need in the way in which they need it when they need it. Consequently, they have developed various kinds of abstracts and indexes, such as *Chemical Abstracts, Biological Abstracts, Chemical Reviews, Review of Education Research, Annual Bibliography of the Modern Language Association,* etc.

And still, we librarians usually go on with our subject cataloging without regard to these publications and without seeming to understand why they exist. And so with other bibliographic work. How many of us, for instance, now that the new *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* is available, will integrate this tool

with our future subject cataloging of English literature? How many of us know how to do this or know *why* we would be doing *what* we would be doing?

These are some of the implications of the new code for me as a university library administrator. It seems to me that some of these questions will have to be faced by the profession. The solution will come only if we start by examining the fundamental assumptions underlying our practices.

In order that my paper may not seem entirely negative in tone and purpose, permit me to suggest an outline of how the problem might be met.

Suggestions

First, we must free ourselves of the burden which we are carrying as a result of our assumption that cataloging for all types of libraries is much the same problem. The university as a social institution exists for a different reason than does the public library—even the *large* public library, the junior college, or the liberal arts college. Its purpose, its clientele, and its materiel are different. It follows, therefore, that its cataloging will be different. This means, specifically, that the Library of Congress Card Division might well study the possibility of issuing various kinds of cards for various kinds of libraries, if it is to continue issuing cards.

Second, we should study the three fundamental needs of location, identification, and subject approach in terms of the various groups in our clientele and of the various kinds of publications. And in making this analysis we should constantly keep in mind the specific functions of the catalog and the bibliography.

For example, the learner who is a beginner in a specific subject may be faced with the problem of locating a specific title or he may be looking for titles which will outline the field and furnish definitions. The learner who is a specialist or a researcher in the same specific subject needs location, identification, and subject guides which are entirely different from those needed by the beginner. Our catalogs minimize these differences as do most of the existing subject bibliographies. Our problem is one of providing tools which will recognize and meet these differences.

Third, we should assume that it is now possible to organize our approach to the problem on a national basis, not on the individual library as a base.

If, for example, what we need is less subject cataloging in card form and more printed bibliographies of various kinds for various purposes, then instead of maintaining hundreds of small groups of catalogers all over the country, why not group these people together in a few centers and put them to work compiling bibliographies?

We should not forget that the Library of Congress, the H. W. Wilson Company, and the publishers of the various indexing and abstracting services are all essential segments of the same circle. At the present time the work of these three groups is disastrously unrelated. The three should be brought together into one single program. Who will have the imagination and ingenuity to do this?

Changing Eras

Fourth, we must remember that an era in American history is ended. No longer can institutions embark upon enterprises or maintain practices without reckoning the costs or disregarding them even if the product seems good. Most of us will return from this conference facing the prob-

lem of reducing our expenditures to meet a declining enrolment. Most of us have already cut so deeply that further cuts can be made only by major amputations. We have been spending staggering sums on cataloging our collections and I am inclined to think that our faculties and administrations do not think the money well spent. The arguments we have been using will, I think, be insufficient.

Fifth, it is a commonly heard observation that we librarians resist changes in our technical processes with a fervor that approaches fanaticism. It is my guess that unless we can break ourselves of this rather primitive attitude toward our technical processes, we will lose control of them just as we are losing control of university libraries through our failure to understand that a community of scholars needs a library "of the scholar, by the scholar, and for the scholar."

If my remarks today seem irrelevant to the question, please accept my explanation that these are the implications which I as an administrator of a university library see in the new code. I speak for myself, not for my colleagues.

The Significance of the Joint University Libraries

(Continued from page 107)

possible. Through the plans which you have perfected and through the building which you have added to the enduring resources of these three institutions, you have made a contribution to the extension and enrichment of education, the full significance of which cannot now be foreseen.

You have placed here at the center of these campuses a library building functionally designed to serve the varied interests of a distinguished community of students and scholars. Rooms for leisure and required reading and for the consultation of periodicals and reference works are available to the undergraduate; carrels in the stacks and special reading rooms are at the disposal of the graduate student; seminars and studies are set apart for the faculty member; space for bibliographical apparatus, for microphotography, for the exhibition and use of special collections, and for the administration of the library as a whole, rounds out the full complement of the requirements of a modern university library. And all of these essentials have been skilfully organized in a building which in beauty of line and impressiveness of form stands as a symbol of the dignity and worth of learning. These are the obvious results of your conscious collaboration. But what you have so splendidly begun will, I am confident, demonstrate what has so frequently been demonstrated of the work of planners and builders heretofore. It will demonstrate that, splendid as have been your vision and accomplishment, you have actually planned and built better than you knew.

A Critical Appraisal of New Ideas in Cataloging

THE following three papers were presented at a meeting of the University Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, December 30, 1941.

By JENS NYHOLM

The Code in the Light of the Critics

Mr. Nyholm is assistant librarian, University of California Library, Berkeley.

The Challenge

The new preliminary edition of the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules* has once again brought the problem of cataloging to the foreground of library discussion. The new code is four times as big as that of 1908 and more than one hundred times as big as the rules printed in the *Library Journal* in 1883. Still, the most significant thing about the new code would appear to be certain features of its make-up and the ten-line "Publisher's Note" preceding the title page. The new make-up divides the code into two parts, the first dealing with entry and heading, the second with the rules for the description of books. The A.L.A. Catalog Code Revision Committee recommends libraries to conform to the rules in Part I, but does not consider it urgent that libraries should adhere closely to those of Part II. This recommendation reveals a late recognition of a new point of view.

The "Publisher's Note" states that there has been considerable disagreement between some catalogers and some administrators concerning the rules, the administrators believing that the rules are unduly elaborate and frequently too costly to follow. To consider the validity of this claim and to establish a basis for a definitive edition a special committee of administrators and catalogers has been appointed. This note, then, and the policy suggested by the make-up of the code present a direct challenge to the library profession: We are asked to take a definite stand with respect to the future cataloging policies of this country.

Almost simultaneously with the publishing of the new code, Andrew D. Osborn's *The Crisis in Cataloging* burst as a bombshell in the catalogers' quiet realm. Shortly after followed the first thought-provoking issue of Mr. Kellar's *Memoranda on Library Cooperation.* One year earlier, in the summer of 1940, a comprehensive library institute, dealing with acquisition and cataloging problems, was held by the Graduate Library School in Chicago, the papers of which appeared in a four-hundred-page volume. About the same time, Mr. Branscomb in his *Teaching*

with Books, took issue with catalogers for the purpose of "directing attention to the problem [of lowering cataloging costs] and of stimulating its discussion." Finally, at the A.L.A. conference in Boston last summer, administrators, catalogers, and the new youth of the Library of Congress got together in an unbiased search for a balancing of ends and means in cataloging.

While the code represents the development of traditional cataloging, many of the viewpoints expressed by the commentators are less orthodox. It is worth considering the validity of the proposals and the criticism of these commentators, and, if found sound, to see how they might affect the code.

Purpose of Revision

It is fortunate that the profession has now become engaged in a discussion of the principles of cataloging and their application; it is unfortunate that this discussion was not carried to a conclusion some ten years ago—before the code was revised. This, however, is now water over the dam. But it is not out of order to point out that the committee entrusted with the revision of the code is hardly to be held responsible for this state of affairs. It was appointed simply "to make necessary revisions in the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules.*"[1] What was understood by "necessary" was not revealed. The committee, therefore, based its program upon the suggestions of that group of librarians whose demands had been instrumental in its appointment, the vocal catalogers. It was their experience that the code of 1908 was basically sound. But they also found that it was neither inclusive nor explicit enough to take care of such problems as would arise in the course of the cataloging done in large and scholarly libraries. This fact became more apparent as the movement of cooperative cataloging gained ground. The committee concluded, as put in the preface to the new code, that "expansion was needed rather than change," and proceeded with its work along this line of reasoning. It would seem that the response to the committee's invitation for suggestions supported this point of view, as borne out by articles in our library periodicals.[2] Even when the reverberations from the depression hit the catalogers, the bulwark of the old standards stood firm. In the summer of 1934 the Catalog Section devoted an entire meeting to the problem of economies in cataloging. The conclusion arrived at in the most talked-about event of the meeting, Miss Mudge's famous paper,[3] was that no true economy could be achieved by the reduction of information given on the catalog cards. When the air echoed with rumors of battles between economy and standards, Mr. Hanson jumped the gun in the *Library Quarterly:* "Finally, let it be decided now, once for all, whether the aim of the new edition shall be to cut costs through simplification of rules . . . or to maintain or even raise present standards."[4]

It is not known that any forceful presentation of claims for simplification was ever made to the committee. Consequently, the road once taken was continued.

The new code, then, is based upon the principles laid down in the code of 1908.

[1] *A.L.A. Handbook* 27:15.

[2] "New York Regional Group of Catalogers. Summary of Discussion of Need for Revision of Catalog Code." *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* No. 3 (1932), 20-29.
Gjelsness, R. H. "Cooperation in Catalog Code Revision." *Ibid.,* No. 5 (1936), 26-35.
Jacobsen, Anna. "Now Is the Time to Speak." *Library Journal* 61:388, May 15, 1936.
Pettee, Julia. "Code Revision—What Do Catalogers Want?" *Ibid.,* 306-08, Apr. 15, 1936.

[3] Mudge, Isadore. "Present Day Economies in Cataloging. as Seen by the Reference Librarian." *Catalogers and Classifiers' Yearbook* No. 4 (1934), 9-23.

[4] Hanson, J. C. M. "Corporate Authorship versus Title Entry." *Library Quarterly* 5:466, Oct. 1935.

Its scope, likewise, remains essentially the same as that of the 1908 code, being restricted to the rules dealing with descriptive cataloging (entry and book description). The great increase in size is due largely to the inclusion of new rules for special classes of material considered inadequately treated in the old code, and the amplification of already existing rules deemed too general to guide in the interpretation of "specific types of cases of frequent occurrence."

The result is a voluminous opus of detailed and explicit rules, with seemingly only one concession to simplification: the recommendation that it be left to the discretion of each individual library as to what extent the rules for description, given in Part 2, should be followed. Presumably, this is the code desired by catalogers, who want a tool which answers questions, so that cataloging may be made easier. Is it also the code desired by administrators, who want the books they administer promptly and inexpensively recorded, so that they may be made available for use?

The Critics

The code of 1908 was completed during a period that may be called the golden era of cataloging. The Library of Congress was recataloging its collection and the code was being prepared in accordance with the system in development in that library. Moreover, the Library of Congress had begun the printing and distribution of its catalog cards. Catalogers could look the future in the eye with an air of assurance: our rules would be codified in a scholarly and reliable fashion; the products of them, the L.C. cards, would be made available to libraries throughout the nation. The cataloging problem appeared to be nearing its solution. It is not difficult to understand that the attitude of the time should crystallize in a tradition still operative in the formulation of the code of today.

Actually, however, the expectations of that time have not been fulfilled. The nation's book resources have increased at an unprecedented rate, causing cataloging to lag far behind accessioning. According to estimates there are in the United States about twelve million titles, out of which only one and one half million are covered by L.C. cards. Cards for about five million additional titles have been contributed to the Union Catalog in Washington by other libraries but are only sparsely available in printed form. It is estimated that uncataloged titles in the United States amount to between two and five and one half million.[5]

That the production of L.C. cards does not cover the demands from the large research libraries was demonstrated by the survey made by the Cooperative Cataloging Committee in 1931,[6] according to which forty-nine libraries in the East were unable to get (or get promptly enough) L.C. cards for 28 per cent of their English titles and 66 per cent of their foreign titles. In libraries all over the country uncataloged material is piling high in storage rooms, inaccessible to the public, while valuable time is consumed in subjecting even the slightest book which does receive cataloging to all the elaborations required by the craft.

Under such circumstances it is natural that some librarians should take exception to the theory of cataloging exemplified in the code. There developed then, in opposi-

[5] Kellar, Herbert A. *Memoranda on Library Cooperation, I* (1941), 18, 21. (Dr. Kellar has not cited any authority for his figures.)

[6] Metcalf, Keyes D. "Cooperative Cataloging." *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* No. 3 (1932), 33.

tion to that trend in cataloging which aims at bibliographical cataloging carrying reference value (represented by such traditionalists as Mr. Hanson and Miss Mudge) another trend concentrating on what has been called "finding cataloging" (represented by such radicals as Mr. Richardson and Mr. Currier). These two trends furnish us with a background for understanding current criticism of cataloging.

Chicago Institute

The Chicago Library Institute's contribution to the discussion was probably chiefly to point out that as yet we have not really assembled sufficient verified data to formulate clear-cut objectives for cataloging. As stated by Mr. Randall, "We supply certain information on the catalog cards in the libraries. We do this at considerable cost, and we do it on the assumption that it is useful. But if we were asked to prove that the usefulness was consistent with its cost, we could do so, I believe, only by stating general assumptions about this usefulness."[7] Similar observations were made in the papers of Mr. Wright,[8] Mr. Miller,[9] and Mr. Rider.[10] The sad conclusion we are forced to draw is that although for years we have been concerned with "how to catalog," we have really never solved all the ramifications of "why we catalog." To establish scientifically sound objectives for cataloging is a task that will take years. The immediate lesson we may draw from the Chicago meeting, perhaps, is this: since we have no demonstrable evidence that our traditional cataloging system is the best possible, we should not be too concerned if, in our efforts to get our uncataloged masses of material made available, we will have to sacrifice some of the standards considered sacrosanct by the traditionalists.

Like so many other administrators, Mr. Branscomb, who follows Mr. Richardson's line of reasoning, is struck by the slowness and the high cost of cataloging. The remedies he suggests insofar as descriptive cataloging is concerned, are the following:[11]

1. Elimination of unnecessary bibliographical details derived in part from the rare book tradition.
2. Simplified cataloging or self-cataloging of certain classes of material, such as public documents, dissertations, and pamphlets.
3. Increased cooperative cataloging, based on correlated specialization in acquisition.

These suggestions coincide with opinions advanced by other critics and will be discussed later. Points one and two appear again in Mr. Osborn's paper, point three in Mr. Kellar's.

Osborn's Crisis in Cataloging

In Mr. Osborn's paper,[12] which cleverly dramatizes the present cataloging situation, we get an effectively formulated theory that strings together certain suggestions—the theory of pragmatic cataloging. Mr. Osborn denounces what he calls the legalistic, the perfectionist, and the bibliographical theories of cataloging—all more or less vaguely in application today. The legalist theory, on which the code is based, calls for rules and definitions to cover every point that arises and tends to promote cataloging for cataloging's sake. The perfectionist theory has as its goal the permanent catalog card so well verified in all respects that it will never have to

[7] Randall, W. M., ed. *The Acquisition and Cataloging of Books.* Chicago, 1940, p. 21.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 117-18.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 220-38.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 136-66.
[11] Branscomb, Harvie. *Teaching with Books.* Chicago, 1940, p. 24-35.
[12] Osborn, Andrew D. "The Crisis in Cataloging." *Library Quarterly* 11:393-411, Oct. 1941. Also published separately.

be done over, but leads to exaggerated research, resulting in accumulation of arrears. The bibliographical theory of cataloging is a branch of bibliography and results in useless details.

To replace these inadequate theories, Mr. Osborn advocates the acceptance of the pragmatic theory of cataloging, according to which cataloging will be conducted "along purely practical lines" on the basis of relatively few and simple rules. Judgment will in many cases take the place of slavish adherence to prescribed rules. Standards will not be defined to "any very great extent" so as to make possible a considerable degree of flexibility in procedures. Individual libraries will adopt such practices as will best meet their particular needs. According to Osborn, a pragmatic approach to cataloging would make cataloging simpler and less expensive and yet produce work that in all essentials would be of high quality.

In advocating his theory, Osborn presents a most enticing picture and one would like to believe that his blueprint would come true. However, one cannot but feel that pragmatic cataloging as such is chiefly an academic concept. All cataloging is to some extent pragmatic, insofar as its rules are, or should be, based upon practical reasoning, and should be applied in a spirit of common sense. All cataloging is also to a certain extent legalistic, insofar as it cannot function without adherence to definite standards. The problem of pragmatic cataloging versus legalistic cataloging is one of degree, not of kind. The difficulty in discussing Osborn's theory is that we do not know the scale of the degrees it spans. We may need to circumscribe the objectives for cataloging, but the rules pertaining to the objectives chosen should be full since work progresses faster when the accumulated experiences of the craft are pooled than when it is left to individual catalogers to figure out the puzzles. Lack of rules would merely lead to the compilation of private files of "decisions." Mr. Osborn admits himself that "it is difficult to systematize cataloging according to the pragmatic theory," but it is precisely systematization we need if we would succeed in sending our uncataloged books to the shelves. If however, Osborn's theory is designed, not to run down the whole way of the scale, but rather to keep us within the limits of the attainable instead of reaching for the unattainable, it may have salutary effects. Perhaps one's disagreement with Osborn is to no small extent to be debited to what is popularly known as semantics, since the suggested nine-point application of his theory is in some particulars very pertinent.

Desirable Practices for Certain Conditions

Consider the first point, calling for a code that would define under what conditions any given practice would be desirable. If the code presented the reasons underlying the rules, ill-founded rules would die a natural death and the good ones would be easier to follow.

Point two, advocating several grades of cataloging, has obvious merits when one realizes the unreasonable cost involved in treating all types of material alike, and is in accordance with practices already partially in effect in many libraries. It is only to be hoped that in our efforts to recognize varying needs we shall not have to preclude the advantage of concerted action.

Point three, the recommendation that self-cataloging methods be extended, is identical with proposals made by Branscomb and Metcalf and seems reasonable, provided it does not militate against hav-

ing the same material cooperatively cataloged.

Point nine, the search for a new and inexpensive method of cataloging serials, echoes a pious hope shared by many.

Kellar's Memoranda

Turning now to Mr. Kellar's *Memoranda,*[13] we find a very positive approach. Kellar recommends a reasonable compromise between finding and reference cataloging, and suggests that the means through which we can hope to cope with our tremendous acquisitions is cooperative enterprises on a nationwide scale. His grandiose plans revolve around the Union Catalog in Washington and reflect the bibliographical visions of Richardson and the beautiful dreams of coordinated book buying. Among the suggestions he has synthesized are these.

1. Current accessions should be divided into two groups: popular material to be briefly cataloged; important material to receive full cataloging, or cataloging according to an intermediate form.

2. Arrears should be searched in the Union Catalog, and the information found there utilized in cataloging the books.

3. A new approach to cooperative cataloging is necessary. *"The ideal to be aimed at . . . is a situation wherein only one card is made for each title in the country, copies of it being supplied promptly on demand to all holding institutions."* One copy of all cards would be kept in the Union Catalog which would serve as a master location file, but printing and distribution of cards could be centralized or decentralized, as desired.

It is obvious that the only way by which we can really make inroads into our accumulations of uncataloged material is through concerted action. A program of such magnitude as the one suggested by Mr. Kellar will encounter difficulties of great complexity. Catalogers should contribute whatever they can to swing the program by insisting upon disciplined adherence to standardized rules and willing departure from established practices, whenever necessary. It should be particularly noted that the rational cataloging envisaged by Kellar calls for a similar application of varying standards as the pragmatic cataloging advocated by Mr. Osborn.

The Boston meeting had symptomatic significance by showing a definite trend toward pragmatic cataloging while at the same time recognizing the need for rational cataloging. "In spite of the fact that cataloging needs for different libraries differ," said Mr. Metcalf, "librarians should help each other. More cooperation should be worked out."[14]

Altogether, recent writers on cataloging have shown considerable dissatisfaction with the traditional cataloging. The same dissatisfaction has led many libraries to formulate simplified rules of their own. In Van Hoesen's *Selective Cataloging,* this trend can be traced back to the beginning of the twenties. The revolt against the code does not, as one might have expected, originate with the small libraries, but rather with the large ones. Among libraries known to have, in one way or another, formulated individual cataloging rules are such institutions as Harvard, New York Public Library, the John Crerar Library, the Enoch Pratt Free Library, and Duke. This development cannot be overlooked in considering the code.

Conclusions

The findings made in the searchlight of the critics may be summarized as follows:

1. We lack definite data for evaluating

[13] Kellar, *op. cit.*

[14] *A.L.A. Bulletin* 35:P-50, Sept. 1941.

our cataloging practices in terms of cost-use balance.

2. With the funds at our disposal we are unable to catalog all the books we acquire. Those we do catalog are cataloged at presumably too high a cost.

3. It is assumed that our shortcomings are due, in part, to unsatisfactorily organized rules calling for too elaborate cataloging and to uneconomical duplication of effort.

4. To remedy this situation, it is suggested that we:

a) Stress the reasons underlying the rules.

b) Simplify the rules.

c) Use varying standards of cataloging for varying types of material.

d) Extend our cooperative enterprises.

The necessity of eventually working out a set of objectives for cataloging on an empiric basis has already been emphasized. With respect to the immediate issue, Stanley Jast's remark about the 1908 edition would unfortunately seem pertinent also to the present one: "The Anglo-American rules have a certain intellectual unity, though it must be confessed that they are generally presented in a fashion to disguise it."[15]

The code should be redesigned in a streamlined form so as to show whatever unity it has, as an initial step to realize what we are really after. Rules embodying fundamental principles should stand out clearly, while special applications of these rules should be given subordinate presentation. An emerging recognition of the desirability of such a design is found in the stating of general rules at the beginning of certain sections. This method should be extended through the whole of the code, also typographically. Basic rules should not be repeated wherever they apply under special conditions, but be reaffirmed by reference if necessary, so as to let the users of the code conceive the rules rather than merely consult them.

A clearer arrangement throughout the code would be desirable. Take for example the rules dealing with illustration. These rules are not set off from those dealing with pagination; nor does the phraseology used in the headings always seem pertinent. Thus, rule No. 307 is simply called "Folded Leaves." The first of these rules (303) is termed "Illustrative Matter," although the rules for illustrative matter continue through rule 321. There is a comprehensive rule (304) with the heading "Illustrations in the Text," but no parallel rule for illustrations outside the text.

In the course of redesigning the rules, brief statements bearing upon the functions of the rules should be incorporated wherever pertinent. An attempt in this direction has been made under "Imprint" (page 253). This practice should be extended with a view to establishing eventually the code of rules founded on reasons, called for by Osborn.

Simplifications

Turning now from the streamlining of the code to the simplification of the rules, we are immediately struck by the size of the code. Critics may be inclined to think that the great increase in size is in itself a sign that the new code will result in more detailed and therefore more costly cataloging. This, of course, is not necessarily so, since additional rules, if they are pertinent and exact, may well have the opposite effect: decrease the time it takes to settle points of doubt. The 1908 and 1941 codes should be rationally compared. In this analysis it might be well to classify the amendments in the following three groups:

A. Amendments constituting a time-saving clarification of time-consuming uncertainties.

[15] Sharp, H. A. *Cataloging.* 2d ed. London, 1937, p. xxi.

E.g. Treatment of the names of married women in Spanish and Dutch (Rule 59 f.1. 3) which present special peculiarities not covered by the general rule.

B. Amendments that will require time-consuming research not justified by the cost-use balance. E.g. Rule requiring reference from see, or successive sees, held by a bishop, *giving years of incumbency* (Rule 50c).

C. Amendments that are in effect time-consuming elaborations of nonessentials. E.g. Rule specifying six different ways of indicating that a book includes illustrative music (Rule 316).

Amendments of the first type would be good; those of the second and third type should be curbed.

It is likely that the new code will make cataloging easier and therefore more economical than did the old one. But this should not satisfy us. The superiority of the new code may consist in many instances merely in its being a desirable clarification of an undesirable practice. We should determine whether the code provides for the kind of cataloging called for under the conditions prevailing today and anticipated tomorrow.

Suggestions for Simplification

Numerous suggestions for simplification could be and have been made. It is possible in this paper merely to indicate the character of some of these with the recommendation that they be subjected to close scrutiny and analysis.

First, let us consider some of the rules for entry, now on the way to becoming sacrosanct. Without being taken for a heretic, is it possible to plead for a final reconsideration of the rules for periodicals and corporate bodies? The incessant recataloging and reprinting caused by the rules calling for entry under latest name certainly represent an economic sacrifice out of balance with the alleged contribution to the public's convenience. The luxuriantly flourishing exceptions to the principal rule that a society is to be entered directly under its name, an institution under place, constitute another doubtful condescension to the supposed desire of the readers. A third questionable feature is found in the rules making choice of entry optional (entry under personal name vs. corporate body, etc.). This new liberality is probably meant to simplify matters, but will rather complicate them by the havoc it may play in union catalogs and cooperative cataloging. As a preparation to a discussion of the possibility of changing these three groups of rules, a study should be made of the extent to which reprinting would be an unconditional prerequisite to effecting a change.

Second, we may simplify the rules by cutting down decorative trimmings, the preparation of which often requires quite some research. The new code has dropped the use of *Mrs.* in headings for married women. Why should we retain titles of honor (Sir, Lord, Lady, Count, Bishop, President, etc.) except when the forename becomes entry word or when necessary to distinguish between persons with the same name?

Third, we may effect economy by giving up esoteric formalism. The example here is, of course, our capitalization rules which abound in subtle distinctions, while a return to ordinary English usage is all that is needed.

Fourth, we might abbreviate long and cumbersome titles, although this is not so important as in Mr. Cutter's days of handwritten cards. When dealing with title pages of rarity and bibliographical uniqueness we may proceed in the opposite direction: reproduce them photographically on our catalog cards in the manner suggested by Leo Crozet.[16]

Fifth, in imprint statement we might be satisfied with one place name and one publisher, under ordinary circumstances.

Sixth, we might reduce our statement of pagination to include only the last page of each group of pagings, with some modifications.

Seventh, we might let "illus." stand for all

[16] Meyer, José. "Catalogs and Cataloging in France." *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* No. 9 (1940), 108-09.

types of illustrative matter, whether included or not included in the pagination, and specify only the most important types, such as portraits and maps.

Eighth, we might follow Miss Morsch's suggestion in respect to size, "give both dimensions for a volume which has a width less than half or more than equal to its height."

Ninth, we might cut down on the number and length of notes, particularly those dealing with bibliographical niceties.

Tenth, and finally, we might limit the use of added entries to the bare minimum of strict necessity.

Multiple Standards

The simplification of rules should be seen in relation to the recognized need for different fullness of cataloging for different types of material. We should maintain a comprehensive code to be used for material requiring full description. The standard for such entries might be referred to as Grade A, and would represent standard cataloging, that is, modified bibliographical and reference cataloging. For material not in need of full treatment, deviations would be indicated in the rules, and this standard might be referred to as Grade B, representing simplified cataloging, that is, essentially finding cataloging. A third, seldom-used category C, for rare books, might be added.

The first three types of simplifications recorded above would pertain to both standard A and B; the others might or might not pertain to both standards. Rules for all standards could easily be incorporated in the same code. Classes of material recommended for cataloging according to Grade B should be specified. Section 23 of the *Prussian Instructions* and Van Hoesen's *Selective Cataloging* might offer suggestions both with respect to these classes and with respect to the simplifications that could be made.

There has been considerable discussion concerning the wisdom or folly of introducing such simplifications. Mr. Bishop[17] has been rather skeptical as regards selective cataloging, Mr. Bay[18] hopeful. It has been maintained that simplifications will neither be wise nor particularly cost-saving. For instance, it has been said that we cannot safely cut our pagination statement since it is an essential clue to variations in editions. This contention has been repudiated by Mr. Currier[19] and by the New York Public Library's continued successful use of brief collation statement. Nor does the omission of pagination in sets seem to cause trouble.

As to cost, it has been argued that the most time-consuming elements of cataloging are the establishing of entries, subject headings, and classification numbers, while book description is usually a relatively simple matter. This is probably true. However, the suggested simplifications do entail the limitation of added entries. As to short-cuts in book description, it would appear that elaborate pagination statement is either time-consuming or—unreliable. If we really were to follow the rules and account for any and every irregularity in paging, we would have actually to *collate* the book, from the first page to the last. This we do not do, with the result that bibliographers don't trust our cataloging. Under these circumstances had we not better restrict our application of the detailed collation rules to those infrequent cases where it is wise to follow them—and we actually do it?

[17] Van Hoesen, H. B., ed. *Selective Cataloging.* New York, 1928, p. 104.

[18] Bay, J. Christian. "Activities of a Scientific Reference Library." *College and Research Libraries* 2:100-01, Mar. 1941.

[19] Currier, Thomas Franklin. "What the Bibliographer Says to the Cataloger." *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* No. 9 (1940), 32-35.

Cooperation

We now come to the final and most important point concerning the future of cataloging—the idea of cooperation in cataloging. The savings arrived at through individual libraries' acceptance of simple rules may not be impressive. The savings achieved by effectively linking simplified rules with cooperative cataloging may be enormous.

We have learned that there are in the Union Catalog cards for about five million books, only vaguely exploited by libraries needing them. The system, for some time in operation in the Library of Congress, of searching titles in the Union Catalog, has not been particularly successful. The chief reason for this seems to be that the quality of the cards copied was undeterminable in advance, and that these cards therefore, could not be used in place of local cards. It is obvious that a library cannot with any degree of satisfaction use in its own catalog, to cover its own holdings, catalog cards the idiosyncrasies of which it may not be able to interpret. The resulting difficulties for the *exchange of cards* may be largely overcome by the systematization of multiple standard cataloging. The card-producing library will simply indicate on all its cards, by a symbol, the standard (A, B, or C) it has followed in cataloging. The card-buying library will simply indicate the grades of cards it will accept. If all sizable libraries would adhere to some prescribed standards, a tremendous impetus would doubtless be given to the establishment of an exchange pool for producers and consumers of catalog cards.

It is difficult to see why it would not be feasible to set up some machinery through which the Library of Congress would be able to supply complete sets of printed, mimeographed, or otherwise duplicated copies of cards contained in the Union Catalog, on terms similar to those governing the sales of its own cards.

Apparatus Necessary

However, the apparatus necessary for effective exchange of catalog cards is a subject that falls outside the scope of this paper. What we are emphasizing here is that the code must be conceived with the vast perspective of cooperative ventures in mind. For union catalog purposes, adherence to a uniform method of entering is as a rule satisfactory; for card exchange purposes standardized book description becomes imperative.

We must therefore go beyond the simple device of adhering to Part 1 of the code, but treating Part 2 *ad libertum*—a suggestion which at best was a temporary expedient only.

The cataloging discussion now charging our thoughts extends far beyond the realm of technicalities. It knocks at the door of the treasurer, challenges the administrator, conditions the scholar's access to his books.

We have not been able to realize what we dreamt when the Library of Congress began the printing of cards. But if we blame this on the Library of Congress, or its system of cataloging, or the code, and say, as it has been said too often for comfort, "Forget about the Library of Congress, forget about any code, go ahead and do your cataloging according to your own standards," then we are lost. But this is exactly what will happen if we do not get together, cool-headed, in a spirit of constructive collaboration. It is very well to point out that different libraries have different needs. It is more important to find

a common denominator for these needs. If the criticism of traditional cataloging degenerates into rugged individualism, we are bound to retrogress; if it develops into a planned economy of cataloging, we shall be on the road to the future. It is suggested that we make the code a guidepost to that road.

By MAURICE F. TAUBER

Subject Cataloging and Classification Approaching the Crossroads

Mr. Tauber is chief, catalog department, University of Chicago Libraries.

Despite the criticisms that may justifiably be directed at descriptive cataloging, particularly its expense and its detailed, bibliographical nature, it generally has been found that the procedures in this sphere of cataloging in university libraries are fairly well standardized on the basis of either the A.L.A. or the L.C. rules. Standardization is less prevalent in the areas of subject headings and classification, although standard lists of headings and systems of arrangement are commonly used. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be some suggestions for reforms in subject heading and a few in classification policies. This paper will deal first of all with some of the reforms that have been proposed. It will also discuss the extent of our knowledge of current subject-heading work and classification practices and of their effects upon use of library materials. Finally, it will record briefly some data concerning centralized and cooperative cataloging and classification, aspects which I assume will be treated by Mr. Haykin.

The participant observer of library use generally is in a better position than the armchair philosopher to discuss these matters in full detail. The latter can raise questions and make suggestions for changes, but unless careful analyses and accurate tests are made, many of our statements regarding subject headings and classifications remain assumptions. Actually there are few data derived from systematic research, as Randall recently pointed out.[1] Since this lack of data makes complete documentation difficult, the following résumé should be regarded as being primarily exploratory. As yet, there are no clear signposts which indicate the procedures which will accomplish the things administrators have come to regard as important in the technical processes—economical practices which serve the users and enable the staff to aid the users.

Subject Headings

Under the rubric of subject headings, it may be said that we think we know why we do certain things, but are pretty

[1] Randall, William M. "The Technical Processes and Library Service," in his *The Acquisition and Cataloging of Books.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940, p. 1-29.

much in the dark regarding the results of our practices. The problem of subject headings is a difficult one in every respect, primarily because, as Osborn recently pointed out,[2] words are not only variously interpreted by users but also change in meaning; because subject heading work is an art rather than a science and depends upon intelligence rather than rules; and because there has been no clear differentiation of the subject needs of patrons in different types of libraries. It is unlikely that we can surmount immediately and completely the difficulties arising from wide connotation of words. However, it should not be impossible with proper instruction and adequate compensation to secure intelligent cataloging personnel with the subject backgrounds and experience that are necessary for discriminatory subject heading work in academic libraries, once we know what approach faculty members and students make to subject heading cards and what uses they make of them. Finally, so far as university libraries are concerned, it may be assumed that they are less likely to attract the heterogeneous clientele found in some other types of libraries.

Even with a qualified personnel will we produce subject headings which, barring such obstacles as misinterpretation, ambiguity, technicality, and obsolescence of words, serve the needs of an academic clientele? This is a crucial question which, without evidence from objective studies, can be answered only in speculative terms. On the basis of knowledge accumulated from the experiences of reference and circulation librarians, it becomes apparent that the procedures for assigning subject headings as set down by Cutter in 1904 are as valid today as they were two decades ago. Therefore, it is interesting to note that suggested changes in procedures which concern such matters as using specific subjects and making adequate cross references have been relatively few. Instead, the critics have been concerned with such aspects as (1) the nature of subject headings themselves, and (2) the number of subject headings. Both of these are considered in relation to the approach of the users.

Nature of Subject Headings

The lack of clarity and the technical and obsolete nature of subject headings have been singled out by critics for consideration. As was noted above, as long as words are used there is likely to be some disagreement in the choice of them. Standard rules and standard lists, such as those of the Library of Congress, can guide the cataloger, but do not remove the difficulties met by users. Connotation of words depends upon such factors as background and training of the individual students, faculty members, and research workers, as well as upon their approach to specific problems. Definitions of terms, with sufficient cross references, however, may reduce considerably the differences which arise from misinterpretation. Instruction in library usage in relation to course work may also serve to minimize difficulties. No such meeting of minds can be easily achieved in regard to technical aspects of subject headings. Butler has called attention to "the futility of subject catalogs as reference tools in any humanistic area,"[3] while Shaw has offered limited evidence which suggests at least that "scientists and technologists do not

[2] Osborn, Andrew D. "The Crisis in Cataloging." *Library Quarterly* 11:409-10, Oct. 1941.

[3] Butler, Pierce. "The Research Worker's Approach to Books—the Humanist," in Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

use library subject catalogs in their specialties."[4] Actual replacement of outmoded subject headings by new terminology is primarily an administrative problem and is carried on only to a small extent in large catalogs because of the expense involved.

Number of Subject Headings

Proposals for catalog reform invariably arise from conditions developing from the size of the catalogs. The potentialities of growth in catalogs in the future have been estimated in astronomical figures by Rider, who, correctly or not, bases his predictions primarily upon past happenings.[5] At the present time, the average library user, confronted with a tray or more of cards on a single subject is said to be confused and bewildered. No evidence regarding the prevalence or intensity of this bewilderment is available. But proposals for eliminating alleged difficulties in using the catalog are plentiful. These include abolishing the catalog, reducing it, or splitting it in various ways. Microphotography and book catalogs have been suggested as substitutes for the present dictionary card catalog. In a recent paper by Pettee,[6] five suggestions for reducing subject entries in catalogs were offered: (1) Eliminating all general headings where a specific heading covers the subject, (2) Selecting the main topic and discarding other closely related headings for overlapping topics, (3) Using cross references to cover double headings, i.e., headings covering identical material in which phraseology is reversed, (4) Omitting certain types of subject headings, and (5) Eliminating analytics for collected essays, including serials and nonmonographic sets. There seems to be no question that in these five areas there are possibilities for substantially reducing the size of the catalog without seriously decreasing its service to users.

Hitchcock[7] has recorded the extent to which eighty-nine university libraries omit subject cards for certain items and has given us some idea of how libraries are attempting to solve the problems of size and cost. She found that for four fifths of the ninety types of materials for which subject headings could be omitted, a significant number of libraries do omit them, even though they do not all select the same types of material. In more than half of the libraries there is common action regarding the omission of subject cards for fourteen main types of materials. These include material with an indefinable subject, material in departmental libraries off campus, pamphlet collections, government document collections, and other materials represented in the catalog under subject by proxy. The general principle of assigning a subject "to every book with a definable subject" is now qualified by such considerations as use, economy, and uniqueness. To the administrator, the problem is to decide whether or not special groups of persons, such as those who use departmental libraries, should be served by the main catalog or by departmental subject catalogs. Hitchcock concludes that small catalogs are more valuable if they are made with the purpose of serving defi-

[4] Shaw, Ralph R. "The Research Worker's Approach to Books—the Scientist," in Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

[5] Rider, Fremont. "Alternatives for the Present Dictionary Catalog," in Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 135-62.

[6] Pettee, Julia. "Adjustments in L.C. Subject Headings for Research Libraries." Paper given at the meeting of the New York Regional Catalog Group, Feb. 14, 1941. Unpublished ms. (Used with permission.)

[7] Hitchcock, Jennette E. "The Coverage of Materials under the Subject Entries of the Dictionary Catalog in American University Libraries." M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1939. Also issued in abstract form in *Library Quarterly* 10:69-94, Jan. 1940.

nite readers. There seems to be little doubt that the divided catalog is an attempt to get at different types of catalog users in the general library. Similarly, the introduction of "self-cataloging" methods indicates an attempt to meet the approach of particular types of library patrons.

Period Cataloging

Another suggestion advanced for overcoming the difficulties of both obsolescence and size is to develop a procedure which might be termed "period cataloging." This might take one of two forms: (1) Placing subject entries for only the latest items in the public catalog and using cross references to the shelflist for earlier works, or (2) Developing a system of duplicate catalogs, one of which is to contain entries for current works, such as those of the last five or ten years. The disadvantages of both of these plans are obvious but unless we have some contrary evidence possibly based on controlled experiments, either plan may have considerable usefulness.

The suggestion has also been made to split the catalog. Papers on this procedure have been appearing with increasing frequency in recent literature. Discussions by Wood, Dean, Lubetzky, and Wright in the *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* for 1939 consider some of the problems which arise from the divided catalog. Whether or not the divided catalog is the solution to the difficulties of size and complexity remains to be seen. It may be said here as elsewhere that at present we have little evidence that the split catalog is the proper alternative in every library. Rider suggests that it may be the beginning of a trend, the first step back to the classed subject catalog, once abandoned for the dictionary catalog. In an article in the first issue of *College and Research Libraries,* Leupp prophesied that the acceptance of the classed catalog is likely to become more common in large libraries.[8] But this also remains to be seen. There should be careful studies of use in those libraries in which catalogs have been divided. It is unfortunate that systematic studies of the use of the catalog were generally not made in the libraries *prior* to the division of entries. Changes have been made too often on the basis of guesswork.

Possibilities for reducing entries in card catalogs are also present in the suggestion to prepare more subject bibliographies and indexes. This is a fertile field that has been given much lip service but not the attention that it deserves. Would it be more economical, for example, to produce cooperatively printed subject analytical indexes of volumes now analyzed separately in card catalogs by many large libraries?

Whether or not storage libraries of old and little-used materials will have some effect upon the present practices of subject cataloging is also a problematical matter. It is possible that the storage of books may be accompanied by the storage of cards which have been reproduced on film. Simple types of cataloging and classification may well be used for materials placed in storage.

Approach of the Users

There is a growing interest in the approach of users to the card catalog. Some individuals who have not thought through all problems involved are willing to abolish the catalog without providing a satisfactory substitute for it. But many librarians, noncatalogers as well as cata-

[8] Leupp, Harold L. "Probable Trends in University Libraries." *College and Research Libraries* 1:60, Dec. 1939.

logers, hold the conservative view that is presented by McColvin, the English librarian, who notes that the catalog cannot be a scientific tool with its essential cross references, analytical entries, and other complications of modern practice and at the same time be "understandable by the veriest child."[9] Although written from a public library viewpoint, the statement seems to apply as well to university libraries. But McColvin avoids the basic question of the need of the complex tool.

Mention may be made at this point of two studies which provide some facts regarding the usefulness of subject catalogs and the uses made of them. Kelley, in her study of the subject approach to books, concluded that "of all the material on a subject in a well-made dictionary catalog, one third is shelved under the subject's specific class number, one third appears in the form of analytical entries shelved in the main series, and one third is shelved elsewhere."[10] Thus it is concluded the subject catalog supplements classification, and its flexibility makes it a better medium than classification for indicating the subject resources of the library.[11]

Kelley's findings indicate the quantity of material one might expect to find through the subject catalog. They do not indicate what actual use is made of subject entries. A preliminary study of the use of the card catalog is reported by Miller in an article to be published shortly in the *Library Quarterly*.[12] Miller found that of the 870 patrons interviewed in the libraries of the universities of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wisconsin, 52 per cent used the catalog to locate books, 41 per cent to select books on a given subject, and 7 per cent for bibliographical information. Undergraduate students at the three institutions "used the catalog more as an aid in selecting books on a given subject than did the graduate students." The latter used the catalog mostly for locating books. Quantitative evidence leads Miller to suggest that subject headings might be developed for undergraduate needs and vocabulary rather than for graduate demands. Local conditions, of course, need to be considered, for instructional and research programs directly affect the use of library materials. The real reason for the absence of use by graduate students and specialists may well lie in the fact that catalogs are infrequently made to fulfill special needs.

[9] McColvin, L. R. *Libraries and the Public.* London, Allen & Unwin, 1937, p. 50.
[10] Kelley, Grace O. *The Classification of Books.* New York, Wilson, 1937, p. 125.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] Miller, Robert A. "On the Use of the Catalog." Unpublished ms. (Used with permission.)

Classification

During the last two decades there has been a gradual shift of interest away from classification as a topic of discussion at conferences and in the professional literature. This has been true largely because most of the major university libraries needing reclassification have been reorganized by the L.C. schedules, and librarians of other institutions have become convinced that the perfect classification is a will-o'-the-wisp and are unwilling to incur the expense of reclassification. Most of the reasons for reclassification have been based on either or both of two assumptions: (1) That the use of the new classification achieves a grouping of the books in the collection that is of greater educational significance and shows to the users the currently accepted relationships among the branches of knowledge more effectively than did the system being replaced, and (2) That the adoption of a new classification will reduce the costs of tech-

nical processes. The specific reasons advanced by librarians for reclassification by the Library of Congress schedules were listed in some detail in a paper at the Graduate Library School Institute last year,[13] and there would be no point in recording them again here. It may be repeated, however, that the absence of a clear understanding of the realities of book classification has resulted in rationalizations on the part of some librarians who attempt to justify reclassification.

Proposed Reforms in Classification

The proposed reforms in classification, in addition to outright reclassification, have been relatively few. Probably the most interesting proposal was made by Lund and Taube.[14] Their scheme of period classification, designed to eliminate reclassification, has been criticized by Bliss and others as being unsound in practice. Studies of the use of library materials from the standpoint of time periods are fundamental to reach decisions on the question of whether or not reclassification would be advantageous or necessary in a particular library. A by-product of such studies might indicate how practicable a period classification such as suggested by Lund and Taube would be.

Rider's proposal for reclassifying without actually changing the books should be noted. According to this procedure, shifts in emphasis resulting from geographical-political-military changes or from new discoveries in research which affect groupings of books are to be readjusted by the transfer of subject cards bodily from one place to another in a classified catalog. The possibilities of this "easy reclassification," as he terms it, should be investigated by students of the technical processes.

Nonclassification, like nonsubject cataloging, has also been proposed and followed in a number of libraries. Periodicals, newspapers, dissertations, reports, obsolete materials, juvenile collections, textbooks, and documents are among the types of materials which have been either broadly classified or not classified at all.

There are some data regarding the potential usefulness of classification and of the use made of systematic arrangement for locating materials. Kelley has demonstrated that classification meets only one third of the potential needs of serious research workers approaching their material from a subject angle.

In a recent study by the writer of library and catalog use by 594 faculty members in two universities, it was found that only about one fourth of the 288 who responded directly used the stacks with any significant frequency. Approximately three fourths of the total number of faculty members responding use the card catalogs in either the departmental or the general library. This is only a little more than 12 per cent of the total faculties. The use of the catalog in departmental libraries is primarily by faculty members who are seeking the locations of new titles. The general card catalog is used mostly by individuals who are searching for entries of new acquisitions or for titles outside their own departmental interests. Forty-one per cent always consulted the card catalog when looking for specific materials. It was also found that except for the Dewey classification, which is known to practically every one who has used libraries, faculty knowledge of classi-

[13] Tauber, Maurice F. "Reclassification and Recataloging of Materials in College and University Libraries," in Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 194-202.

[14] Lund, John J. and Taube, Mortimer. "A Non-Expansive Classification: an Introduction to Period Classification." *Library Quarterly* 7:373-94, July 1937; see also comments by H. E. Bliss, *Library Quarterly* 8:120-24, Jan. 1938, and by W. S. Merrill, *ibid.*, 124-26.

fications other than that of the Library of Congress, is dispersed widely among twenty-one systems. This last fact suggests that the librarian select one system, the L.C. or some other, and apply it consistently. Deviations are expensive and their values in user satisfaction are questionable.

Centralization and Cooperation

Librarians have long paid homage to the idea of centralized and standardized cataloging and classification. The appearance of Library of Congress printed cards, subject heading lists, and classification schedules has been regarded by some librarians to be at least one substantial effort to translate an idea into practice. It is interesting, therefore, to observe the extent to which a group of libraries avail themselves of the classification and cataloging services of the Library of Congress. On the basis of data collected from sixty-six college and university libraries using the Library of Congress classification, it may be shown briefly how closely libraries have accepted L.C. class number assignments, subject headings, and analytical entries for series.

L.C. Class Number Assignments

In only eleven of sixty libraries are L.C. class number assignments accepted in practically every case. Reasons for deviating include L.C. provision of alternative locations, faculty preferences, existence of departmental library systems and special collections, temporary classification, local library policies in handling series, and individual classifiers' idiosyncrasies. In a few of the larger libraries the practice of borrowing manuscript L.C. schedules in incomplete form has made it necessary to forego the use of current L.C. assignments. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that a large number of libraries do not or are not able to take full advantage of centralized classification. This is an important point, for it indicates some of the real difficulties of centralized classification.

L.C. Subject Headings

In seven of sixty-six libraries supplying data, L.C. subject headings have been accepted without modification. In other libraries, subdivisions have been omitted; newer headings substituted, particularly on old L.C. cards; or additional headings supplied. The larger the library, the more likely it is to take advantage of L.C. subject heading work without considerable alteration.

Analysis of Series

The analysis of series represents considerable cataloging beyond the usual cataloging activities in many libraries. This type of work is assumed by librarians to perform a task not accomplished by classification. Complete utilization of the analytical work of L.C. and the Cooperative Cataloging Committee is found in five of the larger libraries. Since this work is costly, a study of the use of analytics seems to be in order. If, as it has been indicated, humanists and scientists do not require this service, is analytical work too expensive a procedure for the average reader?

Conclusions

On the basis of the limited facts that we have, at least four points may be made in summary. These may suggest a possible road for the future.

(1) Catalogs in general university libraries probably should become merely finding lists and buying guides. Subject

catalogs, either in card form or in bibliographies, should be made by subject specialists to fit special needs. These catalogs should be compiled cooperatively after the needs are systematically determined.

(2) Subjective impressions of reference and circulation librarians should be given some consideration in determining cataloging policies, but they should be critically appraised by administrators and catalogers. Too many policies of an encyclopedic, bibliographical, or biographical nature have been introduced because of occasional or supposedly potential demands.

(3) Classification is primarily a librarian's device. As such, the acceptance of one system, preferably one based on a living collection of books, seems the effective procedure for the future. Both period cataloging and period classification should be systematically experimented with for selection of the preferred form.

(4) We cannot expect the program of cooperative and centralized cataloging and classification to be any more than empty words unless catalogers stop thinking of all sorts of reasons for not taking advantage of it.

By DAVID J. HAYKIN

Way to the Future: Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging

Mr. Haykin is chief, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress.

The terms cooperative cataloging and centralized cataloging appear to be perfectly clear and unambiguous. An examination of the literature, however, shows that they have a respectably long semantic history. To begin with, the term "cataloging" itself did not always have the connotation now current in library literature. Until the last three or four decades, it meant, among other things, the preparation of lists of books on different subjects and of different kinds, as well as of so-called universal catalogs, such as that of the International Institute of Bibliography in Brussels. In that sense it is, of course, synonymous with one of the present meanings of the word "bibliography." An examination of the *Bibliography of Cooperative Cataloguing* by Torstein Jahr and Adam J. Strohm offers unmistakable evidence on this point. A polemic engaged in as recently as the early 1930's by the then chairman of the A.L.A. Committee on Bibliography, Ernest Cushing Richardson, and officers of the Association on the scope of the work of that committee as against that of the Committee on Cataloging, is further and more recent evidence on this point. For the purpose of the present discussion, the term "catalog" will be used in its current, very restricted sense of a list of the books in a given collection or library, or in several such libraries, without reference to limitations of subject or kind of book.

Proceeding from this term, cooperative cataloging must refer to the production of the substance of a catalog by the joint effort of two or more libraries. This does not imply that the actual work of preparing catalog entries must be done by the cooperating libraries. If two or more libraries provided the money for a common fund used in preparing entries which are to go into their several catalogs, the undertaking could be properly described as cooperative cataloging. If the work were done at a central point it would be centralized and at the same time cooperative cataloging.

Centralized cataloging need not be cooperative. In one sense, the cataloging done in the main building of a public library system, for use there and in branch catalogs as well, is centralized, though not, strictly speaking, cooperative. Neither is the original and greater part of the cataloging of the Library of Congress cooperative, although it is surely centralized, since it is done centrally and, through the Card Division of the library, is made available to thousands of libraries to be used in their catalogs. It is not cooperative, since it is done by one library primarily for its own use, the cost of it being borne by that library out of funds provided for the purpose of preparing a catalog of its own collections. The sale of its cards is simply a service of the Library of Congress.

Our primary concern is with cooperative cataloging, its whys and wherefores, its methods and procedures, and, above all, its contribution in solving certain pressing problems of American libraries. We shall, therefore, discuss the question of centralized versus other methods of cataloging cooperatively only insofar as it is involved in the choice of the best method to be adopted.

Why the Interest in Cooperative Cataloging Persists

Why has the question of cooperative cataloging come to the fore again? Something—yes, something substantial—has already been achieved in that direction in the past ten years. Why then, at this time, do we imply that it is the "way to the future"? The answer to these questions rests on two considerations, a historical one and a practical one.

The practical aspect of the problem of cataloging rests on the fact that cataloging costs money, that, in fact, it takes a considerable portion of a library's total income. Fortunately or unfortunately, this aspect of cataloging is one which the administrator understands and can compute in terms of dollars and cents. As a basis for discussion on another occasion, it should be pointed out that the administration *cannot* compute the real cost of cataloging since he has no way of gauging the value of the product. In this regard, the cost of cataloging is, of course, closely bound up with the cost of reference work. Be that as it may, the total outlay of money for cataloging can be computed and, therefore, it is possible to determine the average cost per unit of the product, whether the latter be title cataloged, volume recorded in the library's catalog, card filed into it. In the face of a growing demand on the library for service, stationary, or relatively stationary income, and the impossibility of determining the cost of the intangible services which the library renders in providing information and guidance, it is obvious that the economics of the technical processes must be examined and ways found for doing the job at less cost, without perhaps sacrificing the quality, hence usefulness, of the product. Local economies may be effected by vari-

ous means which catalogers understand well and administrators perhaps not well enough. In the light of the great reduction in the cost of cataloging resulting from the use of Library of Congress cards, it is obvious that one of the solutions of the problem of cost lies in cooperative cataloging.

In a country of the great size of ours, where the demand for certain books or classes of books arises simultaneously in different libraries, there is bound to be considerable duplication of book resources, the same work being acquired by many libraries at about the same time. In spite of all efforts which have been, or are likely to be, undertaken for a rational distribution of book resources in this country, duplication is likely to continue. This situation points to cooperative cataloging as an obvious way to reduce cataloging costs.

Historical Consideration

The historical consideration, which has kept cooperative cataloging a live subject of discussion, is the progress made in the direction of cooperation during the past forty years. Library of Congress cataloging is not in the strict sense of the word cooperative. However, catalog cards produced by it have for forty years helped to reduce cataloging costs, maintained a high level of quality, helped secure agreement on cataloging rules and practices, and developed methods and standards for the distribution of cards which have been centrally printed. This, as we shall see, intimately enters into the problem of cooperative cataloging. It has, moreover, led to several card printing and distribution ventures, among them the most recent and important is the one entered upon by the H. W. Wilson Company which provides at a small, uniform price a complete dictionary catalog set of cards for current books which stand high in popular demand.

A more direct influence in keeping cooperative cataloging in the foreground of library interest was the printing by the Library of Congress of catalog entries supplied by other libraries. For other United States government libraries this was first done in 1901; the arrangement was extended to other American libraries in 1910. The preparation of these entries was cooperative in the fullest sense of the word, since each participating library did its work for the benefit of all. The Library of Congress paid the cost of a certain amount of necessary revision and coordination, as well as for the printing of the cards.

The card printing activity of the Library of Congress, including the entries prepared by the Federal government libraries (forming the several so-called government series of the cards) and those prepared by the other American libraries (the so-called "A" series) provided public libraries with cards for nearly all their books. It did not satisfy the needs of college and university libraries to the same extent. An investigation, carried out in 1931 by Paul North Rice in behalf of the newly-formed Cooperative Cataloging Committee of the American Library Association, showed that the Library of Congress satisfied 72 per cent of the need of some forty such libraries for cards for books in English and about a third for books in foreign languages. As the result of the investigation a cooperative cataloging project was initiated in 1932 by the committee with the aid of a subvention from the General Education Board. This project covered new foreign books and monographs in certain scholarly series of

publications largely in foreign languages. It continued under American Library Association auspices until July 1, 1940. It was then taken over by the Library of Congress and six months later merged with the old cooperative work which embraced other than government libraries. It is being carried on vigorously at the present moment and in some of its aspects will serve as a forecast of things to come in the field of cooperative cataloging.

Objectives and Methods

As brought out above, in the discussion of the persistence of the interest in cooperative cataloging, the paramount motive behind it is economic. It is resorted to and justified, properly so, I believe, because it makes it less costly to produce catalog entries. Its prime objective, therefore, is the reduction of the cost of cataloging. There are two other objectives to be pursued, one of them inevitable, the other highly desirable. The product of cooperation should maintain a high average of quality, approaching that of the best product of cataloging by an individual library. If cooperative cataloging results in cheaper, but inferior, entries, it is doomed to failure. The third objective is a negative one: cooperative cataloging must produce adequate catalog entries as quickly as they may be produced otherwise. It should be noted here that the criticism leveled against the cataloging establishment of the Library of Congress has been on the score of the delays in the production of entries, rarely if ever because the entries themselves were inadequate or not high enough in quality.

Bearing in mind these objectives, what conditions must be satisfied in order to carry out successfully a comprehensive undertaking in cooperative cataloging? These conditions depend upon the nature of the project. If the project is one in which the cooperators merely underwrite it, the work being carried out by a separate central cataloging agency, by an auxiliary staff in an established cataloging department, or by a special staff housed in or near such a department, a satisfactory product can be secured: (a) if the staff is made up of competent specialists, each possessing an adequate knowledge of cataloging rules and practices, of works of reference, of certain fields of subject matter, of two or three major languages, and, if possible, some of the less well-known languages; (b) if there is available for its use an adequate reference collection; (c) if provision is made for printing, storage, and distribution of the cards. The quality of the product would be uniform since, in addition to staff and reference collection, all the catalogers would be under the same direction and supervision.

Prepared by Individual Libraries

If, however, the project is one in which entries are prepared by individual libraries and revised and printed centrally, a somewhat different set of conditions must be met. In the first place, agreement on all points of rule and practice must be secured. Each library must undertake only tasks to which its staff is capable of doing full justice, that is, for which its staff possesses the necessary cataloging knowledge and ability, the necessary command of subject matter and languages, and for which its reference collection and consultative personnel are adequate. Each library must bear in mind that it is cataloging not for its own use alone, but for all cooperative libraries. It must disregard local conditions, local needs, and local policies to that extent. This experience at

the Library of Congress has shown to be very difficult to attain. The failure to satisfy this condition throws an undue burden on the staff assigned to the task of revising and coordinating the product of many libraries. It leads to inconsistency and, consequently, to dissatisfaction on the part of the libraries using the cards.

Whether the cataloging is done centrally or not, there must be an adequate distribution of the load, the financial load in case of centralized cataloging, the work load where the actual work is done by the cooperating libraries. This implies a direct correspondence between the load and the benefits derived from the cooperative effort by the individual library. No exact method for computing these benefits is, of course, possible. The number of entries which a given library buys during a given period, say one year, may be considered an adequate measure of the use made by that library of the product of cooperation. If the bookkeeping system used by the cooperative enterprise does not provide data on the number of entries bought, then the money value of the purchases would serve as a measure. To be sure, such a measure would be based upon a period preceding the current one, perhaps the preceding calendar year. Since no better measure can be secured and the same measure would be applied to all the cooperators, no serious injustice would result. What would be more difficult to determine is the price for the product of the cooperative enterprise to be paid by libraries which are not members of it. This need not be gone into at this stage of the discussion, however. The experience of the Cooperative Cataloging Committee project shows that some libraries, the larger and the most interested, do bear a disproportionate share of the load. If that cannot be avoided some method must be found to compensate the most active libraries on the basis of the ratio between their output and the benefits derived by them from the cooperative work.

Cooperative Classification

In most libraries the classification of books forms an integral part of the cataloging process. In any case, it is an important element of the cost. For classifying books covering the whole range of human knowledge, without the benefit of prior classification of the same works by another library, the cost may well average twenty-five cents a title. That has, in fact, been the experience of the decimal classification project begun in 1930 by several hundred libraries under the auspices of the American Library Association. This project belongs to the category of centralized cooperation. It was originally underwritten by the libraries, but the work has been carried on at the Library of Congress by a staff of well-qualified assistants. Because it was able to carry out its full program of classification well within the amount of money provided by the cooperators, it must be considered a successful project in every way. In 1933 it was taken over by the Library of Congress and assigned to the Card Division, on the assumption that the presence of the decimal classification numbers on the printed catalog cards increased the sales of the cards to an amount which would justify the maintenance of the project out of Card Division funds. In 1934 it went to form a section of the Cooperative Cataloging and Classification Service and late in 1940 with the internal reorganization of the Library of Congress, it became a part of the newly-formed Subject Cataloging Division.

The experience of this project has evolved methods appropriate to cooperation in classification. It has made clear that, by its very nature, the work is limited both in scope and method. Since not all libraries use the same classification system, no one system would be useful to all libraries to the same extent for this reason alone. All libraries have stated or implied policies in classification which would nullify or reduce the value of cooperative classification to many of them. Because the intellectual background and capacity of the classifier are directly reflected in the classifying he does, distributive cooperation in classification is out of the question; the work must be done centrally. It must be done centrally also for the reason that consistency in the interpretation of books and classification system requires it. Consistency can be achieved by the employment of a well-qualified staff all working under the same supervisory officer and by the maintenance of some kind of a shelflist.

These considerations practically preclude the coupling of cooperative classification with a distributive system of cooperative cataloging. (It is questionable whether cooperators could reach general agreement on a choice of classification system or common classification policies.) Revision and coordination of class numbers at a central point without the books is practically out of the question. If the cataloging is done centrally, however, classification can readily form a part of the process.

Cooperative Cataloging in the Future

If we gave the imagination free reign, we could envisage a state of things in which catalog entries were either prepared at the source, that is by the publishers, or at a central bureau to which all the acquisitions of all cooperating libraries could be sent for cataloging. The bureau could have as competent a staff as any to be found in libraries at the present time. It would be large enough to include specialists in all fields of knowledge, linguists, expert catalogers. It could be housed so as to have ready access to adequate reference collections. It would, in short, be equipped to do cataloging accurate and adequate to all purposes. It would, however, be extremely unwieldy. It could not fully justify itself on economic grounds, since it would have to provide entries wanted by only two or three libraries, and the proportion of such books to the whole would be great enough to make the unit cost of cards to all libraries high. Then, there is the fundamental consideration that many libraries could not participate in such a project because of existing controls on the use of their funds, controls which would be difficult to change or remove. Furthermore, it would deprive libraries of the use of their books pending cataloging, would add transportation costs to the cost of cataloging, and would involve the same delays and time losses which now occur in large libraries for various reasons.

The best practical solution of the cataloging problem still is cooperation, not a particular form of cooperation, but a combination of features of all. Lines of direction have already been drawn in this country which make it easier to realize a fairly comprehensive program of cooperative cataloging. There is, for example, fairly complete agreement on rules of cataloging. Not by the fiat of a bureaucrat but by progressive, voluntary action, American libraries have achieved a large degree of uniformity in cataloging practices. The wide distribution of the catalog cards

of the Library of Congress has contributed in large measure to uniformity of practice, since libraries found it desirable to follow the lead of the Library of Congress in order to have all catalog entries in their own catalogs uniform. The printing by the Library of Congress of entries prepared by other libraries was another, though less important, factor. And finally, the experience of the Library of Congress in centralized cataloging (for that is what its distribution of cards amounts to) and of the project initiated and sponsored by the Cooperative Cataloging Committee in cooperative cataloging on a distributive basis, furnish a foundation for an extension of cooperation in cataloging.

L.C. Will Provide Entries

The Library of Congress will continue to provide a large proportion of the entries for public libraries and an increasing proportion for college, university, and special libraries. May we look forward to the day when the Library of Congress would supply complete dictionary catalog sets of cards with headings printed on them? This would make it possible for libraries to get the cards into their catalogs without having to add headings and revise them.

A step in enlarging the program of cooperative cataloging has recently been taken by the cooperative cataloging project of the Library of Congress which definitely points the way to the future. The libraries of universities having presses have been asked to supply entries for the output of their presses. This is, in effect, cataloging by publishers. While it is unlikely that commercial publishers would, or could, engage in cataloging, this arrangement could be extended to all publishing agencies of institutions having libraries. This would apply to state libraries in the case of state documents, to public libraries in the case of the publications of municipalities, libraries of societies and institutions for their publications, particularly where analytical cataloging of their several serial publications is concerned.

Foreign publications, for want of which the Library of Congress does not have or does not prepare entries, could be cataloged as they are now on a cooperative basis. Machinery would have to be provided to secure the extension of the program of cataloging for this category of books, particularly the analytical cataloging of serial publications, and for the proper distribution of the cataloging load among the cooperating libraries.

Extension of Distributive Work

To be sure, this extension of distributive work presupposes the willingness and ability of the Library of Congress to expand its facilities for the revision of entries and the printing and distribution of cards. Means would then have to be provided either by the Federal government or the libraries which would be the beneficiaries of the work. The work could probably be carried on elsewhere at a large library center. A staff could be provided and a reference collection would be available as well as at the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress, however, already maintains a large nucleus for this work and has the storage and distribution facilities for large sales operations in this field. It seems inevitable, therefore, that the work be centered at the Library of Congress. Whether this would mean an expansion of the cooperative cataloging facilities there or the establishment of a

(Continued on page 175)

By CLIFFORD B. CLAPP

Critique and Design on the Cost of Cataloging

Mr. Clapp is head of the catalog department, University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia.

THIS YEAR a call has been issued to reconsider cataloging. It has been a call so clear and insistent that it cannot be disregarded either by catalogers, or administrators of cataloging, or administrators of libraries. It concerns the theory or philosophy of cataloging, its efficiency, and even more its cost. In recent talks on the subject at the meetings of the American Library Association in Boston and Cambridge stress has been laid on the cost of cataloging. Both Mr. Metcalf[1] and Mr. Osborn[2] have issued a challenge to catalogers and administrators to remedy the increasingly difficult situation of mounting costs.[3] When, with their papers before us, we rehearse their analyses and appeals, we find them both taking a very sympathetic position in placing a joint responsibility on library administrator and cataloger and in appealing for more mutual understanding and more collaboration.

[1] Metcalf, Keyes D. "The Attitude of the Library Administrator toward Cataloging." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 35:P-48-51, Sept. 1941.

[2] Osborn, Andrew D. *The Crisis in Cataloging.* 1941. Also in the *Library Quarterly* 11:409-10, Oct. 1941.

[3] Since the present paper was written the experimental division on library cooperation of the Library of Congress has issued as its first bulletin Herbert A. Kellar's *Memoranda on Library Cooperation,* Sept. 1941, which contains an important section on the same situation and the related problems of cataloging arrears.

At the same time there seems to be an implication that the difficulties are mainly the cataloger's problem, which the librarian must study and *help* her to solve. The feeling is probably pretty general that the major responsibility is the cataloger's. A somewhat different view is shown in Miss MacDonald's paper,[4] which followed Mr. Metcalf's at Boston. It is evident that she expects the librarian to take more of the responsibility than merely to insist and discuss and agree, that she expects of him at least a full partnership in the question and probably more. Is not that implied when she says, "Librarians need to develop a positive attitude to the card catalog"? It is evident, I am sure, when, after pointing out the development of specialized collections and services she asks (and answers), "Who is primarily responsible for such increases? Certainly not the catalogers."

It is not fair nor wise to place much stress on the share of responsibility to be borne by librarian or catalog department administrator or any group in the personnel. Mr. Metcalf and Mr. Osborn agree that administrators and catalogers have grown too far apart. The present paper, written from the point of view of the manager of a catalog department, is an attempt to lay the basis for some remedial

[4] MacDonald, M. Ruth. "The Cataloger's Response to the Administrator." *A.L.A. Bulletin* 35:58-59, Sept. 1941.

action in the face of this situation. What is written here is no catholicon. It teems with disputable assertions. But it is in some respect representative of conditions and needs observed by the writer in various libraries and may afford to librarians and catalogers some suggestions for definite cooperation and improvement.

There is a tendency to think about cataloging in general terms and in bulk. Viewed in such general fashion there is really no such thing as the cost of cataloging. There is forgetfulness of the fact that the cataloging dollar, like the housewife's dollar, is a relative thing. There is some disregard of the professions of catalogers that they are responding to the demands of reference departments, the cost of whose service is more seldom questioned. If these things seem to show too little thinking about cataloging, some other things indicate one-sided thinking or insufficient basic knowledge about cataloging.

For example, there is a tendency to blame the complexity of catalog cards and the multiplicity of entries and of special catalogs for the entire sin of cataloging expense. Overelaboration of records is, of course, a feature of costliness, but it is not *per se* the prime offender. Its main significance is not, in this age of rules and of machines, that it is time-consuming but that it tends to disproportionately expensive organization and personnel.

Mr. Osborn devotes several pages to the theories and niceties of cataloging and related functions of catalog departments and only two to the organization of the department. But he perfectly appreciates the importance of the organization to problems of cost, for he says, "Organizational questions are equally pressing," and he indicates several of these questions.

Place of Personnel

The place of personnel in catalog department work is probably the hardest thing to discuss in library publications. Questions of personnel are vital elements in cataloging cost, and they present the most serious problems of both catalog department heads and librarians, or at least they ought to be so considered.

In a paper like the present one, no all-inclusive design for catalog department economy could possibly be set up. But it seems very important to present something, and for the sake of emphasis I am offering my little something with the personal pronoun.

Mr. Osborn has suggested that the library administrator needs to know a good deal about cataloging from the inside, and that a prospective administrator might well spend a year as an intern in a good catalog department. Let me suggest as an alternative to this that an actual library administrator spend a month in a bad cataloging department, or at least in one where the cost is running too high. I think that if that were done a sort of pattern would form in his conception of his catalog department, which would embrace much more than the questions of cataloging codes, theories of cataloging, and multiplicity of records.

In some libraries he would find that costs suffer because of poor equipment, because of great distances between points within the scope of everyday activities, and because reference tools are lacking. Aside from such local conditions, first, he would criticize bad habits in administration, like neglecting to see things through, toleration of disorderliness, and use of caustic criticism. Next, he would observe inadequate cooperation by superiors and coordinate departments in furnishing in-

formation or making decisions. Then he would notice improper assignment of duties, especially neglect of possibilities of using lower-priced people on some work. I think he would discover that there was want of a simple system of dealing with portions of the material coming for cataloging. I think he would criticize the department for its habit of applying maximum instead of minimum standards of treatment in classifying and cataloging and shelflisting and marking. Among his classifiers and catalogers he would see that there was failure to discriminate between the permanent and the temporary and between the pristine and the already indexed or described. He would find, if it were an old catalog department, an inadequate psychological reaction to the situation, by higher-priced people especially, shown by overmeticulousness in unimportant matters, inability to place reliance on others, unadaptiveness to new work or methods, and, finally, slowing down.

Conditions Affecting Cost

Such are some of the conditions affecting the cost of cataloging that would be found in some departments. It would be silly, of course, to infer any implication here that they are characteristic of all catalog departments or that all these conditions would prevail in one department.

A longer period in the catalog department would bring out some factors of larger scale and significance that dominate the work no matter what may be its personnel and organization. The first is the exceeding importance of machines of the right type and quantity, like typewriters, electric erasers, and book trucks, and, in some circumstances, mimeograph and pasting machines. The next is proper light and air and some degree of medical inspection. Another is the planned flow of books into the department. Then there is the need for better budgeting of libraries and catalog departments.

It is a fact, strange as it may seem, that many cataloging chiefs are less bound by tradition and seemingly inexorable precedent than librarians and the heads of the public departments and less afraid of doing wrong than the principal members of their own staffs. Supposing that in the search for efficiency and reformation of costs such a catalog department head is sitting at a council table with the librarian or his deputy, with papers and plans giving a broad view of the department. A candid exposition would probably reveal three main things appearing as immovable as mountains: first, a well-developed organization on traditional lines; second, a high cataloging standard; and third, a practical disregard of the possibility of dispatching collections of books, papers, and costs on anything like a budgetary basis.

Librarian Knows Functions

The librarian would know the individual positions and salaries of the members of the catalog department, and he would know in a general way the functions they were performing, like classifying, shelflisting, filing, and so on, and the types of material they were handling, such as art, science, and education. Of course he would know their individualities and capabilities. It is doubtful whether he would know that card work was 25 per cent of cost, and administration 7 per cent, or that the work of a shelflister was one tenth or one twenty-fifth of the cost of cataloging.

In a library adding ten, twenty, or thirty thousand volumes a year and handling a considerable amount of special col-

lection and departmental library work, together with cooperative work, films, maps, and the like, there are at least a dozen basic positions or functions in the cataloging service. From two to four of these may be combined into single positions.

In smaller libraries the functions of these positions exist but may be still further combined. For example, in a library handling six thousand volumes without much departmental library work the dozen places might be combined into about four. In a very large library the skeleton outline would be developed according to need by adding more persons in some positions, more catalogers, more typists, and so on. This is a standard organization, not necessarily the ideal one.

Positions in Catalog Department

These dozen positions are (1) superintendent, (2) distributor, (3) classifier, (4) general cataloger, (5) serials cataloger, (6) shelflister, (7) card secretary, (8) reviser, (9) card filer, (10) typist, (11) book preparer, (12) departmental library agent. The distributor receives books from half a dozen different sources and routes them to classifiers and catalogers, may interpose at any point in the routine to forward books, and is the natural follow-up agent for anything that is searched for or anything that is unduly delayed. Hers is a key position, which demands one of the most intelligent and well-balanced persons on the staff. Nevertheless, her salary rating will average five against a classifier's six or seven. The serials cataloger may catalog new serials and adjust old ones, but she must (if the position is a single one) devote most of her time to routine adding of volumes and parts. In salary she may rate as low as four, but, if there is a full-fledged serials division with two or more members, she may go as high as seven. The card secretary orders and receives printed cards, directs mimeograph work, and supervises the typists. In smaller departments her work may be combined with shelflisting, revision, filing, searching files, etc. The book preparer pastes and marks books. The departmental library agent forwards books to departmental libraries, receives books from them, visits them, advises their librarians and the officers of the department, sometimes does their filing, and in general acts as liaison agent with the main library. She has to be a person of tact and ability, but her rating is only three or four, unless she acts as classifier or cataloger for departments. The card filer, responsible only for filing in the public catalog, rates at three or four on the basis of her main work, and since she files only about half time she does other work of about the same grade. In a small library she may be responsible for other files. In a library with a depository Library of Congress catalog a separate filer is necessary. In the very large library the work of neither filing position can be handled by one person alone.

The ratings of which I have spoken are salary ratings, based on a unit system in which a page is one unit. The ratings are those which it is necessary to give to the positions in order to obtain and keep competent people. They are as follows: (1) Superintendent, 7 to 14; (2) Distributor, 4 to 6; (3) Classifier, 5 to 8; (4) Cataloger, 4 to 7; (5) Serials cataloger, 4 to 7; (6) Shelflister, 3 to 5; (7) Card secretary, 3 to 4; (8) Reviser, 4 to 5; (9) Card filer, 3 to 4; (10) Typist, 2 to 3; (11) Book preparer, 2 to 3; (12) Departmental agent, 3 to 4.

Minimum Requirements

After a couple of combinations of positions, with a skeleton staff of ten, at the lowest ratings, the catalog department's minimum requirements will be just under forty; without such combinations, and with average ratings, the requirements will be between fifty-five and sixty. If the unit of rating is valued at $300, the department must pay a minimum of about $12,000 and a maximum of $18,000, the latter at average and not maximum salaries, to carry on the twelve functions that have been detailed.

What can be obtained for this money?

Matching volumes cataloged against number of people in the department, calculations made on the basis of figures from several large university libraries show production ranging all the way from eight hundred to twenty-five hundred or three thousand volumes cataloged per year per person in the department. In the case of the eight hundred there is reason to think that the department employed quite a number of low-priced people, who gave either part-time or else low-degree service. In the case of the other extreme, twenty-five hundred or three thousand, I apprehend that everything went through the mill, foreign dissertations, multiple copies of textbooks, etc. When you try to match volumes cataloged against salaries of people in the departments, there are closer similarities between some libraries and greater discrepancies between some. Figures for several show cost per volume ranging from 85¢ to $1.15, and I hear sometimes of 65¢ and $2. I do not believe any reliance can be placed on anything but the most exact knowledge of conditions. The figures are practically worthless, except to suggest that what I call a skeleton staff of ten people paid rather poorly might catalog fifteen thousand volumes a year.

Some Doing Less Work

If that is the case, then some catalog departments are doing proportionately less work with a larger staff, or a higher-paid one, than if they had the skeleton staff. Bear in mind that I say proportionately. The work is intricate and positions are therefore mixed and therefore calculations are intricate and uncertain. But when cataloging staffs tend to produce less in proportion to their increase in size and in total salaries it means overbalancing somewhere. It may mean that the best-paid people, doing the higher-grade work, are doing comparatively less of it and that the work is in a manner of speaking too high grade. Some of it has to be refined but probably too much of it is too refined. The point, then, is that one method of reducing cost is to give a better balance to the staff, emphasizing possibly the middle grades. That may mean emphasizing the middle grades of work as well as of positions, and that probably means retreating somewhat from completeness and perfection.

The same conclusion must inevitably be reached if we read and reread the practical suggestions of Mr. Metcalf and Mr. Osborn. The same conclusion was reached longer ago by Ernest Cushing Richardson. Bibliographical cataloging has its place but numerically it is a minor one. Scholarship on the staff fosters respect for our classifiers and catalogers but scholarly and scientific research are not a main object of our work. I should be the last person to advocate lowering the standard of a major portion of our personnel. Bibliographers in a catalog department are necessary. There will be no quarrel

with bibliographical cataloging of incunabula, early Americana, literary first editions, fine books, local items, and many undescribed rarities. The work on these must not be in the hands of second-rate people. But the place for most bibliographical work is in the keeping of certain types of special library, of custodians of special collections, and of private research. Full and well-nigh perfect cataloging is now standard, brought to that rating by the Library of Congress cards and by the A.L.A. rules. It is not the having of this perfection that is expensive, it is the perfect devotion to it, the single standard, the lapse from reason.

Three Grades of Cataloging

Mr. Osborn makes what is perhaps his most important practical suggestion when he calls for "three distinct and approved grades of cataloging" which would be followed "in the code" as well as "in many libraries." In connection with this we must not miss his statement that "standard cataloging," one of his three approved grades, "would be less detailed in many respects than the 1908 code or the Library of Congress formerly required."

If the cost of cataloging is to be lowered permanently a greater proportion of it must be done within the medium grades of salary requirement and a greater reliance must be placed on carefully developed lower grades. This has been exemplified in the development of preliminary cataloging at Harvard, a method adaptable in some degree at least to high-priced departments anywhere—prophecies of woe to the contrary notwithstanding.

Cataloging on the Library of Congress standard cannot be done except by a thoroughly trained or experienced professional staff. The great obstacle to acceptance of a medium grade of cataloging is that for many years now it has not been nationally standard. Therefore, the distribution of standard medium cards for a portion of the cataloging of a subject or type of material under the sponsorship of a national agency would definitely promote lower costs. The means are available: first, the outline of a code in Miss Mann's "local unit" card; second, the use of lower-cost preparation, perhaps on the lines of the Harvard system; third, the supplying of copy for current publications within certain agreed fields by ten or more libraries;[5] fourth, the production and distribution by one or more centers under the direction and authority of the Library of Congress of a considerable quantity of mimeographed instead of printed cards.[6] Mimeographed cards, now being produced by the University of Pennsylvania and some other libraries, are at their best equal to or better than the best typewritten cards. By the combination of these stages the cataloging, production, distribution, and receipt of cards for a portion of the material cataloged could take place all within one week, at a lower cost than present Library of Congress work.

Mechanics of Plan

It would be impossible in a paper of this length to indicate the mechanics of such a plan,[7] which is, after all, only one of the ways of standardizing medium cataloging—perhaps I should say restandardizing it. There are two or three ways of carrying out the project or of experimenting with it on a considerable scale. It is easy to understand the objections to a

[5] Most of the libraries should be located in big cities and act as sponsors for cooperative cataloging in those metropolitan areas.
[6] Enabling the Library of Congress to print more cards for important works.
[7] Kellar invites the discussion of such plans.

plan like this on the part of catalogers disliking to see a retrogression in the beauty and legibility of even a portion of the cards, and on the part of librarians responsive to the demands of reference departments for the highest degree of inclusiveness of information. Nevertheless, if the single aim is economy, there is here required new understanding, willingness, and courage, and no little energy and tedious study.

Alteration of the organization of a catalog department has to come about gradually. In contemplating such alterations, happy may be the librarian who has arrears of material to be cataloged.[8] It is the easier for him to make shifts of work without injustice to existing personnel. This is not intended to justify arrears; but in streamlining the department, to use Mr. Osborn's term, the librarian with arrears has the greater resources. He can budget these resources over, say, a three-year period. After providing for the books purchased for immediate use he can determine the time required and the cost of preparation of the rest of the books, including the collections on hand and the average accessions of gifts. He can force the cataloging, or in some cases the simple classifying and indexing, of, say, one third of the material in one year, within the stipulated cost, by whatever method is required to accomplish it. This is important: by whatever method is required to accomplish it. He can receive periodically, or at the end of the year, a statement of arrears within the plan, with the reasons therefor, of unforeseen accessions and of special unforeseen work, and of the cost of carrying on the plan on the same or a revised basis.

[8] See the figures on arrears in Kellar's Memoranda.

Budgetary Control

Handling library accessions in this way is the identical twin of budgetary procedure, concerning which John H. MacDonald has written,[9] "Budgetary control assumes a genuine desire on the part of the entire organization, from the president to the office boy, to keep as close to the previously charted course as possible, to accept responsibility for doing so, to check actual performance against the plans, and in every other respect to use the budget as a real road map to reach the previously established goal."

But if the library has no arrears—and this would be a happy situation, too—does not the plan of dispatching collections on a budgetary basis suggest the idea of some temporary cataloging or even listing, pending the grouping of lots or masses of like material which can be most economically done by groups? Since the question is how to economize, the hypothetical diminishing of the catalog's service and all the predicted difficulties of reclaiming books for completion of work cannot be allowed to prevent the consideration of such a policy for at least a portion of the acquisitions or accumulations.

In the present year there is much mooting of cataloging questions. On account of the issuance of the tentative second edition of the A.L.A. code, there will be enough discussion to satisfy the most enthusiastic or serious devotees of technical excellence. The time should not pass without a very serious, if not enthusiastic, discussion of the technique involved in reform of catalog department expense, and discussion should not end without some sort of national or general action.

[9] MacDonald, John H. *Practical Budget Procedure*, New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939, p. 2.

Cataloging Problems and Research Libraries

The following statements were presented to the Association of Research Libraries at their Chicago meeting, December 29, 1941, held in conjunction with the Midwinter Conference of the American Library Association. Miss Root is president of the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the A.L.A. and Mr. Mumford is chief of the Preparations Division of the New York Public Library.

PART I

By MARION M. ROOT

THE PRELIMINARY AMERICAN SECOND EDITION of the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules* has been available for three months and has been diligently studied by individual catalogers, by catalog departments, and regional catalog groups, and by some administrators and reference workers. That study will continue and, of course, no one is prepared at this early date to make a final statement. It is possible, however, to see the present trend of opinion and it is that which I shall try briefly to present. As you are aware, the situation is complicated by the fact that after revision had been under way for some years and was nearing completion, it became for the first time very clear first to some administrators and then to a few catalogers that the problem of cataloging costs was extremely serious and that current cataloging theory and practice must be re-examined to see whether there were nonessential elements which could be eliminated. In our study then, we are not merely considering how successfully the code does what it set out to do, which was to expand the old rules to cover types of publications inadequately covered in the 1908 edition and to record the best pre-1940 descriptive cataloging practice with sufficient fulness to meet at least the ordinary needs of the scholarly library. In the light of the pressing demand for economy, a demand made all the more urgent by our entry into the war, we are attempting also to discover those modifications in our cataloging practice which will result in lower processing cost without great impairment in service. Those modifications once found must be incorporated in the code.

You will recall that the code is divided into two parts; the first dealing with entry and heading, the second with the description of the book (transcription of title, imprint, collation, notes). In regard to part one, it is the general opinion that in these days of cooperative cataloging and union catalogs, uniformity in choice of entry is well-nigh essential, though it is admitted that to avoid wholesale recataloging, minor variations in form of entry are permissible for libraries having large amounts of material already cataloged in a manner inconsistent with L.C. and A.L.A. rules. Most of the material in

the code dealing with choice of entry and form of entry is regarded as satisfactory, though more detailed treatment is needed in a few cases and some unnecessary detail can be eliminated. Some rearrangement is desired but reconsideration is needed of surprisingly few points.

In regard to part two, uniformity in the amount of descriptive detail to be included on the catalog card is now generally recognized to be unnecessary if not indeed undesirable. The amount of detail will and should vary between one library and another and for different types of material within one library. No general rules expressed in a few neat sentences can determine for libraries in general the point of equilibrium between increased cost and decreased usefulness. That point is determined by the balance of many factors which vary with the institution. That being the case, it is an open question whether it is necessary or suitable for the A.L.A. to issue rules for descriptive cataloging at all. But, while the amount of detail may vary, there seems to be no good reason for individual decisions as to the language in which we shall record such detail as is to be included on our cards. Standardized notes, abbreviations, etc., are likely to mean a saving in time and so in cost. Many libraries, therefore, will welcome a manual of accepted practice, and L.C. practice would undoubtedly be preferred in view of the widespread use of L.C. cards. It has been suggested, therefore, that part two of the code be replaced by a manual of L.C. practice.

Manual of L.C. Practice

If we are to have such a manual, whether issued by A.L.A. or by L.C., should it contain the minimum amount of detail or approach the maximum which will be needed by the scholarly library? In the comments which have been received there is surprising unanimity on this point, catalogers and administrators alike stressing the desirability of having fairly full rules available, to be applied with discretion. One cataloger writes "The code should be as complete as it is possible for the committee to make it. Catalogers then can make definite decisions as to which of the rules and usage their libraries with the staff and funds at their disposal can afford to use, or which rules will supply the extent of fulness in cataloging which their type of library needs. The other rules may then be disregarded or used only when the need is definitely felt." Or as an administrator puts it "A great deal of the criticism of the code as being too detailed and legalistic seems to be based upon the idea that every library will have to follow the rules in every detail. My idea of the code is that the committee has labored to bring together and organize in a systematic manner cataloging rules, principles, and practices which already exist and are being followed in varying degrees by libraries of various sorts and sizes. The administrative problem of the extent of simplification of cataloging practices for various kinds of material is something which cannot be covered in a code but must be worked out primarily by the individual libraries. This has been done by libraries working under the old code and the L.C. rules. It seems to me that it can be done even more easily and economically now that the full rules have been put into a form which permits convenient consultation and annotation for a particular library's practice." May I emphasize the fact that there is no indication of an intention on the part of any library to adopt the second part of the

code, hook, line, and sinker, but the opinion has been expressed again and again that catalogers should have a knowledge of the full rules and simplify to meet the needs of the particular library; that simplified rules are not needed, but that each library should work out its own abridgment to meet its own particular needs. One cataloger goes so far as to add "If a librarian feels that this plan is impracticable, what he needs is a new staff and not a new code."

Decisions on Simplification

The fact that decisions as to simplification in descriptive cataloging must be made in a particular library on the basis of its particular needs, is generally recognized, but by whom are the decisions to be made? It would not be wise nor practical for catalogers to decide without regard to the needs of the reference and acquisition staffs. Most catalogers are convinced that a prerequisite to the solution of the cataloging problem is finding the answer to the question: For whose use and for what purpose is the catalog made?

For whom is your catalog made and what service is expected from it? Do you need to know from your catalog how many pages there are in a book? Do you need to know whether it contains maps, portraits, diagrams, or genealogical tables? Will your art department be satisfied with cards which do not mention the presence of colored illustrations? This matter of simplification must be regarded as an administrative problem to be worked out by administrative, reference, and cataloging staffs together, in the closest cooperation. May I, for the Division of Cataloging and Classification, express the hope that if conferences to this end have not already begun in your library, you will initiate them on your return. It is our conviction that only by such detailed study on the part of administrators, catalogers, and reference workers together, will any library be able to know its needs and to find a satisfactory answer to its cataloging problem. "Administrators" and "catalogers" in general can never reach a solution which will be satisfactory to all libraries, but a solution for each library, on the basis of its own peculiar needs, can be attained by its own staff working together in this way. Such conferences have already proved their worth in several institutions, as Mr. Mumford is about to tell you, and we are confident that you too will find in them the means of solving your cataloging problem.

PART II

L. QUINCY MUMFORD

The Executive Secretary has suggested that I report to you informally on some developments which have recently taken place at the Library of Congress and at the New York Public Library on the important matter of cataloging rules and practice.

The problem of cataloging cost was well stated by Mr. Metcalf and Dr. Osborn in papers at the Boston Conference.

Those of you who did not hear Dr. Osborn's paper, entitled "The Crisis in Cataloging," have probably read it in its printed form. It is not my intention to restate in detail the problem which they presented but to mention some steps which have been taken toward attacking that problem.

First, a word about the Library of Congress. Miss Root has mentioned the amount of study which has been made on the new code by individuals and by regional catalogers' groups. In discussions of these groups on the effects of the code on cataloging costs, the question has been asked: "What is the attitude of the Library of Congress? Does it intend to simplify its rules and practices?" I should like to say that the Library of Congress is very keenly conscious of the high cost of cataloging and is eager to cooperate with other libraries in working towards a common solution. It has been faced for a long time with accumulated arrearages of unprocessed material and with the needs of outside libraries to obtain cards more promptly. The report of the librarians' committee and the resulting reorganization in the Processing Division have served to focus attention upon the necessity of finding ways to increase production and to reduce costs in the cataloging process. The new A.L.A. code has provided a basis for the examination of present rules and practices. As Miss Root has suggested, it is not a matter which the cataloging divisions alone can settle. Since the cataloging policy of the library concerns vitally the reference and acquisition divisions, it becomes a general administrative problem. As a step towards a solution, in October, a questionnaire drawn up by the chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division was submitted to the Acquisition and Reference Divisions in an effort to find out what cataloging information is essential to the proper performance of the respective functions of these divisions. The questionnaire has been followed up by conferences and discussions with those in charge of the reference and acquisition work. There is no doubt that the Library of Congress is ready to make changes in its practices as far as its own needs will permit. No final decisions have been made but the conferences and discussions indicate that considerable simplifications can be accomplished.

At New York Public Library

At the New York Public Library, a thorough examination of the catalog and its use has been going on. Because of diminishing income, the library has felt the need for retrenchment to some extent in its processing activities. With this necessity in mind, a committee was appointed early in the fall to study the situation and make recommendations. The committee has consisted of the chief of the preparation division, the chief cataloger, an assistant from the administrative office and one from the general reference service, and the chief of the largest subject division. This committee has been meeting once or twice a week during the fall in an effort to determine just what kind of information is most essential in the library's catalogs and what can be eliminated with the least effect on the reference service and with appreciable savings in cost. For a number of years, efforts have been made there to effect some economy in cataloging by giving briefer treatment to certain types of material. For instance, directories and trade catalogs have been arranged in alphabetic files without formal cataloging; pamphlets of subject interest

only have been bound together and cataloged only under subject. It has been possible at times to group material together and to make a checklist only for it. In such cases, a statement is placed in the catalog showing that the library has the material and how to obtain it. The committee, now engaged in studying further ways of making economies, is seeking to find, first, other types or forms of cataloging which can be reduced or eliminated; and second, to find ways of shortening the cataloging operation on material which requires regular cataloging treatment. The findings of the committee are still in a tentative stage but enough progress has been made to demonstrate the value of this kind of collaboration between the administrative, reference, and cataloging staffs. It is believed that appreciable savings can be effected without detracting seriously from the value of the catalog.

Informal Conference

In order to provide a basis for agreement on a simplified procedure which the Library of Congress might adopt and which might serve libraries throughout the country, late in November the Descriptive Cataloging Division in the Library of Congress sponsored an informal conference between representatives of Harvard University, the Columbia University Library School, the New York Public Library, and the Library of Congress. Members of the group included expert catalogers, as well as members with reference and administrative experience. These representatives met for two days in New York and discussed cataloging practices which might be shortened or eliminated. In every instance, the effect of such action upon the acquisition and reference work of libraries was considered. The results of this conference were highly gratifying. The group was almost in complete accord on points where simplification can be made.

You may ask what are some of the changes which can be made and which will bring about savings. Time does not permit a detailed account of these points here, but I should like to make a general statement on the question. The general principles on which we have been proceeding are:

Possible Changes

First: To reduce as far as possible the recording of information which requires extensive research on the part of the cataloger. Lengthy searching to find the dates of birth and death and full name of a modern author where there is no conflict in the catalog is an example. Searching to establish the date of publication of an unimportant modern book would be another example. It is likely that other libraries will be able to go further than the Library of Congress in reducing work of this kind since other libraries depend somewhat upon the research of the Library of Congress, and frequent reprinting of cards would be necessary if no research were done. I think, however, it may be possible for the Library of Congress to reduce substantially the amount of research.

Second: To shorten or omit entirely certain kinds of information in the transcription of the title page. Titles may be shortened and imprints simplified.

Third: To eliminate as far as possible rules and practice which constitute debatable and time-consuming points for the cataloger. This latter category applies particularly to collation and notes. It is hard to realize how much time goes into the recording of pagination and illustra-

tions under the present practice of the Library of Congress. There is no doubt that simple notations of these items will result in a considerable saving of time.

Additional time and study is needed at the Library of Congress on these points, but, as I have indicated, it seems certain that some simplifications can be made. It is our belief that a simplified card which will serve the needs of the Library of Congress will be adequate for other libraries. In fact, many libraries may be able to simplify their practices farther than the Library of Congress can do. When specific details have become more settled, you will be informed of the changes which the Library of Congress proposes to make. In the meantime, as Miss Root has suggested, it will be extremely helpful if individual librarians will confer with their acquisition, reference, and cataloging staffs and seek to determine what types of information are needed in the catalogs of their respective libraries. Such study is essential for the formulation of a policy in the individual library and will greatly assist the Library of Congress in modifying its own practice.

Way to the Future: Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging

(Continued from page 162)

separate unit coordinated with the cooperative work there is subject to consideration by representatives of cooperating libraries and of the Library of Congress. The Librarian of Congress has on several occasions expressed his interest in the extension of cooperative cataloging.

Cooperative Work the Practical Solution of the Cataloging Problem

To sum up, the practical solution of the cataloging problem, assuming that the catalog is not to be abolished altogether as has been recently, perhaps not too seriously, proposed by some administrators, or reduced to a simple author list, lies in cooperative work. Cooperative cataloging should not confine itself to one particular method. Libraries should continue to make use of the cataloging product of the Library of Congress and amplify the scope of its work by some auxiliary form of either centralized or distributive cooperation. If all libraries find the H. W. Wilson Company's product adequate, the Library of Congress could perhaps be relieved of the burden of supplying cards for the most popular books.

By ELEANOR MITCHELL

The Photograph Collection and its Problems

Miss Mitchell is assisting in the organization of the Biblioteca del Estado de Jalisco at Guadalajara, Mexico. *This paper was presented January 29, 1941, at a meeting of the College Art Association held at the University of Chicago.*

Need for a Broad Viewpoint

THE ACQUISITION, care, and arrangement of the photograph and slide collection has developed into a formidable science, demanding of its administering custodian enduring patience, long-range perspective, and clear thinking. Too often photograph curators become so engulfed in detail that they lose sight of their true function in the educational scheme of their college or university art departments or in their museum. With them rests the responsibility of making readily available to faculty, students, curators, and laymen a collection of visual material of widely diversified subject matter. An objective approach and the use of the simplest procedures of custodianship should be a constant goal.

In the past, interest has been directed toward the acquisition and care of the photograph and slide collection, problems which have been well summarized by the late Elizabeth M. Fisher of the Ryerson Art Library of the Chicago Art Institute in her excellent discussion of "The Fine Arts Picture Collection" in the *Library Journal* for October 15, 1939. Less attention has been given to the formulation of a code for curators. The following remarks, based on a survey of fourteen representative photograph collections in colleges, universities, and museums, suggest the bewildering number of methods in use in our institutions. A careful study of these variations emphasizes the desirability of further comparison and analysis leading toward the publication of a handbook which might be useful in the organization of the photograph collection.

There is a tendency among guardians of these collections to consider the material in their charge overprecious. Rules should be made sparingly with service ever kept in mind. For example, college and university departments might consider a broader loan policy of photographic material. In some institutions photographs not on reserve for specific courses are loaned to students for a period of a week, with a fine of one cent a day for late return. Would it not be well to risk occasional damage to photographs, if in doing so, material were made more accessible to interested students? Although newly-acquired photographs are invariably brought to the attention of the professor or staff member concerned with the subject, others may be given an idea of the expanding collection by frequently-changed exhibits of current additions.

Housing the Collection

Of the fourteen institutions under consideration all but three house their extensive photograph collections in vertical files. The two types in use are files of drawers and, more frequently, cabinets made up of many compartments with a drop front for each tier. It is surprising that more institutions have not resorted to the compartment file which requires the least physical exertion of any of the systems. This setup was illustrated by photograph and diagram as early as 1911 in the publication of the Metropolitan Museum of Art concerned with *Classification Systems in Use in the Library*. The three institutions which do not use vertical files, house their material in boxes, a method which is being adopted by the National Gallery of Art in Washington. The use of boxes seems to be more popular in large institutions where files are not open to the public and are likely to be farther from the study room. Here untrained attendants produce on request material called for by classification number or subject, in contrast to the trained curators or art-minded students in charge of the average college or university collection.

The Card Catalog—Special Indexes

The question of a card index to the collection should be decided only after considering the cost of preparation in time, labor, and materials in relation to the projected use to which such a catalog would be put. In the small college or university with a limited art enrolment and few or no graduate students, there is scarcely a need for a catalog of the collection. But in the larger university, with emphasis on graduate study or in the museum dealing with a varied public, a catalog is highly desirable and insures the tracing of every iconographic detail. Whether or not a catalog is planned every collection should have an authority file of place and personal names. Other special indexes may prove valuable in lieu of a catalog: an index of colored reproductions, an index of architects when architecture is filed under period or country and city, or an index of portraits where painting and sculpture are filed by artist. The presence of a catalog reduces in one sense the worries of the classifier. If a photograph of an object may logically be filed in any one of three places, the classifier may decide upon one and make subject cards for all three to prevent the photograph's being "lost" to the public. For example the reproduction of a jeweled book cover may be readily produced whether the inquirer is interested in metal-work, gems, or book arts.

Classification

Curators charged with the responsibility of the photograph collection with one accord pass by the minor issues raised by acquisition, accession, mounting, and housing, to the absorbing task of arrangement or classification. The libraries of our country are, for the most part, taken care of adequately by two systems of classification, the Dewey Decimal and the Library of Congress. A survey of the fourteen representative classification schemes for photograph collections is discouraging in that it reveals no standardization. While no two systems of notation are exactly alike, several are based on the original Metropolitan Museum of Art plan. Each new curator who comes along scans the existing systems, is confounded, extracts some features from one classification, some from another, and adds a new scheme which increases the confusion. It may be

too late to bring order out of the present chaos, but perhaps something can be done to formulate a guide or code for those yet unborn collections.

Whether the curator is fond of the A.B.C.'s or "plays the numbers," that these are merely arbitrary symbols to designate classification and so are relatively unimportant in comparison to logical arrangement of material, must be remembered. Since all of these institutions, however, college, university, or museum, have photograph collections composed, on the whole, of the same type of subject matter, can it be the use to which the collection is put in these institutions that causes the variety in classification? The photograph and slide collection of the college and university art department is drawn upon to visualize the history of art course, varyingly concerned with subject, period, or country, such as the history of the portrait, medieval art, or French painting. Is the function of the museum collection so completely at variance with this concept? It must be able to supply the curator of sculpture with material for his scholarly report on the newly-acquired Gothic statue of the Virgin, the textile designer for inspiration in creating new fabrics, or the schoolteacher with a series of historic castles.

Discrepancy in Classification

Some of the discrepancy in classification notation has undoubtedly been brought about by professors and museum curators who, though scholars and specialists in their fields, are not library-detail-minded and are apt to think only in terms of their own courses or subjects, rather than of the photograph collection as a whole. Photograph curators have sometimes admitted that they arrange their material to suit the needs, or rather the wishes, of their faculty and staff, perhaps not giving due consideration to the fact that in five years another set of scholars with different fields of interest may be on hand to request a rearrangement of material. The intrusion of personal interests and prejudices is apparently hard to avoid but should be guarded against.

In this survey of classification schemes it has been observed that the favored plan is a primary division of the collection by subject, such as architecture, sculpture, painting, and the various minor arts. Under subject arrangement the general order is by period, country, and then alphabetically by city or artist. Museums tend to one or two period subdivisions, as do several colleges and universities. Some universities, however, have as many as five or more time or culture subdivisions. The two-period division is that most frequently encountered and to the librarian-curator, accustomed to classifying books by subject, is likely to suggest itself as a more simple and logical arrangement. Here the mental process is Ancient Architecture—Greek or Roman; Modern Architecture—English, French, or German. Modern is here thought of varyingly as the beginning of the Christian era or 600 A.D. On the other hand the curriculum-minded college or university curator may be far more period-conscious and insist on medieval French architecture as being more closely allied to English and German medieval architecture than to French architecture as a whole. In other words, he is less nationality bound, which may be perfectly consistent with the international nature of the medieval period, but it still makes difficult the classifying of a photograph of a building which is the work of medieval, renaissance, and modern craftsmen.

New York University's System

New York University has departed from the usual division of material by subject in organizing its collection: first by large culture circles, such as ancient cultures of the Mediterranean (A); second, by smaller culture circles as, for example, Greece and Rome (O); third, by medium (20000—sculpture); fourth, by country (100—Greece); fifth, by style or historical time period (4—Hellenistic). The resulting call number would be AO 20104.

Similarly:

BC	Europe	Medieval-Baroque
20405	Sculpture	Italy XV century
270	Donatello	

Here the sixth subdivision (270) is a numerical symbol to indicate alphabetical arrangement according to artist. In other instances it might refer to place or iconography.

Opinions differ as to the necessity of planning the university photograph or slide classification around the courses conducted. Some institutions go so far as to have groups of photographs for each course filed separately. Since the same photograph may be used at different times during the year by different professors, a common file of material with a share-the-wealth program would eliminate the necessity of duplicates. Lists of photographs used for a course could be kept from one year to another as a basic group for future study. Whether the emphasis of the classification is on subject, period, or style, the imaginative professor will draw upon material from varying groups of classification subdivisions. Any classification scheme becomes of necessity complicated. It is likely that professor or layman in using the collection must be inducted into the mysteries of local arrangement and can be trained to use one system as well as another, with preference always for any simplification possible. Two of the college and university systems studied having no catalogs, eliminate entirely any classification symbols although each follows a definite plan of filing according to subject and multiperiod division.

Emphasize Alphabet and Number

It has been indicated that some classifications emphasize the alphabetical symbol and some the number. Actually all but two of the schemes under consideration use a mixed notation, these two being entirely numerical. In the three institutions which use a letter as the first symbol, the letter does not, however, have the same signification. At New York University, as noted above, the letter indicates a culture circle. In the department of fine arts at the University of Pittsburgh, the photograph collection, which is adjacent to a library classified according to the Library of Congress scheme, uses corresponding symbols as far as L.C. goes and then employs other letters for additional subjects. The third institution in this category, the Ryerson Library, is the most consistent in its use of the alphabet for here *A* stands for architecture, *B* for biography, *C* for customs and manners, etc. Here also, except in the ancient division, country is indicated by its first letter or letters as are further subdivisions.

The Cutter tables, so sacred to librarians in their arrangement of personal and place names, have at New York University not been used in order to avoid any possible confusion in filing photographs or slides of monuments located at one site but dating from different periods. In the letter and number combinations on the

telephone dial, the library of the Museum of Modern Art has found a workable substitute for the Cutter tables.

Problems in Classification

To discuss here the innumerable problems which confront the classifier would be impossible, but a few which have suggested themselves in this study may be mentioned. It may be well to admit that in many instances there is no right or wrong answer.

Anonymous and Attributed Works. The filing of anonymous painting and sculpture has on occasion presented itself as a problem. Varyingly it may be found at the beginning or at the end of the whole subject, arranged according to century, school, or place. The Fogg Museum of Art system differs in that an anonymous Italian painting of the fifteenth century would be arbitrarily placed in the alphabetical arrangement of artists under the word Italy. The symbol here would be It115. At the University of Pittsburgh where painting and sculpture are separated into ancient, medieval, and renaissance-modern categories, anonymous works of the renaissance, if medieval in spirit, are apt to be classed under the medieval period.

In some collections, works of uncertain attribution, copies, school pieces, etc., are interfiled with the original works of an artist and are sometimes filed according to degree of attribution at the end of the group of authenticated works. In the case of questioned attributions where there are duplicate photographs or slides, some institutions file duplicates under the various attributions. Likewise with two photographs of a mural painting, one might be filed under the subject of mural painting, the other with the easel works of an artist under painting. In the case of architectural sculpture, one photograph might be placed with architecture, a duplicate with sculpture. Some curators may prefer all photographs of one specific object in one place in the file with cross references under other possible locations.

Drawings and Prints. Curators have apparently been disturbed as to the classifying of drawings and prints. Most frequently drawings are found as a subdivision of painting and occasionally prints are also classed here. Actually it seems quite logical to juxtapose these three forms of the artist's graphic expression, using some symbol to group together the works in any one medium. In more cases than not, prints are classed as a generic group which may be more practical in institutions where a course in the subject is given. Drawings are also in some schemes thought of as being in a class by themselves. Sometimes the division is called graphic arts and both drawings and prints are included.

Manuscripts. Manuscripts are for the most part thought of as belonging to that bewildering miscellanea known as the minor arts, but occasionally one finds them grouped under painting with some distinguishing symbol to place them apart. In institutions which have an extensive collection they may be treated as a distinct class. The classification of any movable object primarily according to place is the separation of material according to a variable factor which has no significance in the history of art. In theory, place control may not be a logical subdivision of media but it may be the most practical solution in certain cases. A report from one of the curators concerned with manuscripts at the Morgan Library, indicates that, although manuscripts may be thought of by country and century, arrangement

by library may be simpler, inasmuch as school and century attribution in the medieval period is so uncertain. This system is reasonable in view of the fact that most sound and scholarly publications in discussing manuscripts invariably mention their location and number, many being known only by library number. Here is another case where the special index is important, in the event that no general card catalog exists.

Minor Arts. The problem of the minor arts is undoubtedly the most confusing of all to the curator. A summary of various current practices in the collections surveyed shows that with only one exception the primary division of the general class of minor arts is by medium, such as works in mineral, metal-work, wood, textiles, etc. The following tabulation indicates three possible divisions under medium, the first being that most frequently encountered:

I.	II.	III.
Metalwork	Metalwork	Metalwork
Italy	Italy	16th century
Bronze	16th century	Italy
16th century	Bronze	Bronze

Still another idea is presented at the University of Pittsburgh which divides the minor arts, considered as one whole class, into time and culture periods before any other subdivision. Here all ancient minor arts are together, as are all those of the medieval, renaissance-modern periods and Mohammedan and Oriental cultures.

These general subdivisions under the minor arts are difficult to decide upon. In a sense one system may work out as satisfactorily as another. Disregarding the intrusion of personal prejudice, the preferential arrangement may have been regulated by convenience. The further breaking-up of a class of material provides even more serious complications. For instance, if American pottery is classed together, is it the fact that the reproduced object is Rookwood ware, that it was made in the nineteenth century, that it is in the Chicago Art Institute collection, or that it is a plate rather than a bowl, which should take precedence? This is a subject which needs much consideration. In making public their classification schemes institutions should give much more complete information as to actual detailed practices.

Theory of Arrangement

It may be repeated that, whether we are thinking of the minor arts or the collection as a whole, it does not seem possible to say that one system of arrangement is right, another wrong. In a small collection of a few thousand photographs and slides the medievalist may be made happy by placing all medieval arts in one drawer, box, or group of compartments. The curator of so small a collection has comparatively few worries.

But when one thinks of a collection of twenty thousand photographs, sixty thousand, one hundred thousand, or more, ever expanding, then more discrimination, keener judgment in classification must be applied. The thought must be not the mere massing of groups of like material together, but the problem of extracting one photograph from one hundred thousand. How often does the professor or museum curator, whether specialist in medieval, Oriental, or modern fields, come to the collection with the idea of just any photograph of medieval architecture or minor arts, Oriental painting or modern industrial design? He is more apt to want a French Romanesque church and have Moissac in mind, or to think of an Italian, thirteenth-century crozier in the Uffizi.

The orientalist is likely to be concerned with a Sung scroll in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the man of today may want a streamlined refrigerator and know there is a good American one designed by Norman Bel Geddes.

That classification should be a tool and not an end in itself cannot be reiterated too often. Although consistency in the pattern of classification from the general to the specific is desirable, success of the scheme should not be judged by the ability to follow completely the broad division of categories in the individual and minute problems which arise in a large collection. The custodian of the photograph and slide collection will have need of all the clear-sightedness and ingenuity that can be mustered, but there must ever be kept in mind the fundamental purpose of the collection, the use to which it will be put, and the public it serves.

Review Articles

Is the Golden Age Really Over?

A discussion based upon the following recent publications: Andrew D. Osborn's The Crisis in Cataloging (American Library Institute, 1941); A.L.A. Catalog Rules; Author and Title Entries (Prepared by the A.L.A. Catalog Code Revision Committee with the collaboration of a committee of the British Library Association. Preliminary American second edition. American Library Association, 1941); Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook No. 9 (American Library Association, 1941).

ALMOST two decades ago, Cutter in the prefatory note to the fourth edition of *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*[1] stated that he doubted the need for another edition of the work, since the cooperative cataloging activity of the Library of Congress was destined to solve the major cataloging problems of libraries. Although there would be some books that the libraries would need to catalog without benefit of L.C. services, Cutter wrote: "Still I cannot help thinking that the golden age of cataloging is over, and the difficulties and discussions which have furnished an innocent pleasure to so many will interest them no more. Another lost art."[2]

Much has happened since 1904. The statement that L.C. printed cards and other services have aided considerably in reducing the problems of cataloging in large libraries is undeniable. To state that they have eliminated all difficulties of cataloging in the large library is stretching the truth beyond its elasticity. The present discussion of cataloging problems by Osborn and the several writers in the ninth *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* indicates clearly that cataloging problems are assuming the importance that they once held.

Although we have established an elaborate catalog code and systems of classification, administrators and catalogers apparently are not satisfied with current conditions. The presence of large arrears and the high costs of the technical processes, combined with a recognition of the difficulties arising from the size and complexity of catalogs and obsolescence of classification systems, have precipitated a number of suggestions for change. We, therefore, look at a library situation torn by argument and counter-proposals that extend more widely and run deeper than any other library history has shown since 1876 or the early years of the twentieth century. The existence of the catalog code and of the systems of book arrangement seems insufficient to prevent the so-called "crisis in cataloging." Instead, it seems as if progress in the technical processes has served to complicate, rather than simplify, service to readers.

Such a state of affairs has led to some confusion and pessimism among librarians. "Frustration" and "complexity" have become bywords of speakers and writers, and drastic and radical alternatives in cataloging and classification policies and

[1] Cutter, C. A. *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog.* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1904, p. 5.
[2] *Loc. cit.*

practices have been proposed. Arrears in large libraries are explained as inevitable parts of a chaotic condition brought about by the inability to make detailed, bibliographical cataloging, unsystematic and illogical subject heading work, and close classification meet satisfactorily the problems created by the presence of vast book collections. Pessimism is evident in the administrators' attacks upon the high costs of the technical processes. It does not seem to matter much with administrators that their criticisms are too general. They do not stop to examine just where the confusion or difficulty lies. Strictly speaking, it does not lie with the catalog code, in either its old form or in the preliminary American second edition, or with classifications. Although possessing limitations, the code and systems of arrangement are extraordinarily suitable for the purposes for which they have been designed. But despite this, it is clear that some essential factors have been generally overlooked.

Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook

In the ninth *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook,* for example, there are discussions of such matters as the distinction between bibliography and cataloging, the value of the work of the decimal classification section at the Library of Congress, the form that state author headings should take, the available sources for subject headings, how to teach document cataloging from the point of view of document catalogers, and costs of cataloging. All these are important questions to both administrators and catalogers, yet they are concerned primarily with techniques rather than with results or use. The yearbooks of former years follow a similar pattern. Articles by Grace O. Kelley and William M. Randall in the second *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* (1930) clearly indicated that unless we learn more about the results of classification and cataloging, practices will continue to be based on notions conceived by our predecessors living in a different era and faced with different problems. Osborn emphasizes this fact. His attempt to categorize cataloging practice on the basis of four theories—legalistic, perfectionist, bibliographic, and pragmatic—is successful to the extent that it gives us an idea of the different approaches to the problem. It fails to the extent that it implies that cataloging can be legalistic without being pragmatic, or pragmatic without being legalistic. All four categories overlap one another.

Osborn's criticism of detailed cataloging is not without point, yet the criticism seems somewhat misdirected. The rules themselves are not to blame for a crisis in cataloging; neither are the compilers who are putting into form practices according to the expressed wishes of catalogers. Probably the censure, if censuring must be done, should be aimed at four groups of individuals: (1) catalogers, (2) administrators, including both chief librarians and head catalogers, (3) reference librarians, and (4) teachers of cataloging.

It has been repeated from time to time that catalogers have been unable to discriminate between essentials and nonessentials, and have thus failed to integrate their work with the demands and approach of users. It might be stated that there has been no careful plan of recruiting cataloging personnel. As a result, it is not surprising that catalogers as a group contain too many individuals who are inclined to follow rather than to question. It is trite but true, of course, that administrators and head catalogers have too infrequently given catalogers a chance to ex-

press themselves. Reference librarians who wish the card catalog to answer every possible question without considering the consequences of their demands upon the catalog department have been responsible to a larger degree than has generally been believed for the development of what Osborn has termed legalistic, perfectionist, and bibliographical cataloging. Finally, library school instructors of cataloging who have failed to keep in touch with practice have continued to teach young librarians theory without serious attempts to instil in them the urge to examine their work on the basis of individual cases or from the standpoint of users.

Publications Important

The three publications under discussion, therefore, are important at this time when administrators and catalogers have begun to wonder seriously about cataloging rules and processes. The new edition of the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules* appears as a result of the demands for uniformity in practice. The development of cooperative cataloging and union catalogs undoubtedly has increased the pressure for a set of rules which would provide guidance on matters which were not in existence when the 1908 rules were compiled. The inclusion of a considerable number of examples seems particularly useful. Sensibly, acceptable variations in practice are noted. The fact that the volume contains so many details and rules does not discredit it. If librarianship is to be scientific at all, codification of rules and principles seems basic. Osborn actually indicts American catalogers when he implies that they are incapable of using intelligence in applying rules to practical needs.

It might be pointed out that the division of the new edition of the rules into two parts—I. Entry and Heading, and II. Description of Book—is a highly desirable feature. It is to be expected that library practice so far as entry and heading are concerned will be uniform. Practice in regard to the description of the books should undoubtedly vary.

The golden age of cataloging in its old sense may be over. But it is on the threshold of an interesting and challenging era. There can be but one conclusion to the present difficulties in cataloging so far as large libraries are concerned: increased and systematic cooperation and centralization. Administrators, catalogers, reference librarians, and teachers of cataloging will need to expend considerable thought on the problem if cataloging will meet the needs of users effectively and economically. And it is necessary to determine accurately just what the users—patrons and staff members—really require. Future numbers of the *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* might well be devoted to a further discussion of these problems.—*Maurice F. Tauber, University of Chicago Libraries.*

Incunabula in American Libraries. Edited by Margaret Bingham Stillwell. Bibliographical Society of America, New York, 1940: 8vo., xiv, 619 p.

THE FIRST of anything exerts a strong appeal upon well-nigh everyone and the sentimental attraction seems often to be in inverse ratio to its current usefulness or even to the comprehension of those who are the most fervent worshippers at its shrine. Nothing has exemplified this more curiously than the books of the fifteenth century, long segregated in highly honored seclusion under the impressive caption of "incunabula."

The book that marked the end of experimentation and the inauguration of the business of printing as a commercial craft was the so-called Gutenberg Bible, a weighty two-volume publication designed for use at church altars. Men who had had a hand in the production of that work were still actively engaged in making other and handier books when copies of the First Bible began to pass out of the churches into the possession of collectors who treasured it, not because they wanted to read it but because of the story that went with it. As a result of this contemporary interest among the laity rather than by the churchmen, there are nearly fifty copies of the First Bible whose stigmata are as carefully registered as those of blooded calves or pearls of great price. Other Bibles just as good, or better for actual use, were on the market while that original edition was still to be had at the publication price, but copies of these, which were in production before the first one had been completed, are now virtually unprocurable. There are a dozen copies of the First in American libraries. Three or four of these same institutions consider themselves fortunate in being able to exhibit a single leaf or two from the one that was probably second in date. That this is a normal situation is shown by the parallel case of the first book printed in English America, just a hundred years after printing began on the Western Hemisphere. There are eleven copies registered of that *Bay Psalm Book;* there are two copies of the second edition of 1647 and only one of the edition of 1651.

Fifteenth century books were over a hundred years old when discriminating book collectors began, so far as can now be told, to pick and choose the cleanest copies of the oldest texts of the books they liked to read. They liked to fondle slightly old editions of Plutarch or Herodotus, of Aeschylus or Terence, with the same satisfactions that their spiritual progeny find in an untrimmed Endymion or Hiawatha "as issued." Until the Napoleonic era, incunabula continued to be the literary firsts for collectors who had been drilled at school and university on the Latin and Greek classics until they could catch an error in scansion or a false quantity in a quotation in a speech by a parliamentary colleague. After that, new men and new fortunes brought changes in the book market as in other lines of serious work and play. Halfway through the twentieth century, the chief of the patent department of the world's most embracive utility for relaxation reads Homer in his Florence edition of 1488, noting misprints and textual variations, but this is nowadays unusual. For most of the nineteenth century, the collecting of Fifteeners was the following of a tradition, the treasuring of curiosities of a long ago.

A hundred years ago now, college people and especially the librarians who found themselves in charge of considerable numbers of fifteenth century books, became uneasy over their inability to answer many of the questions that were being asked them, not about the contents but about other aspects of these ancient tomes. Most often these were questions as to who and when and where. Out of these grew a new science of book knowledge christened "bibliography." Two Englishmen had most to do with its upbringing.

William Blades, when he found that his printing business was in shape to take care of itself, turned his leisurely attention to composing a life of the first English printer, William Caxton. He read widely

and visited archives in search of what could be found concerning his subject. More important, he looked at the actual books that carry Caxton's name with the critical eye of a master printer who had watched over the work that was being done in his own establishment. Noting that Caxton's work, like his own, sometimes revealed manufacturing tricks and slips, he went on to examine all the copies of the original publications that he could locate. As he went along, Blades not only kept careful memoranda of what he found, but he devised his own technical methods of describing the books to meet the needs that he was himself creating. These are far from satisfying the meticulous requirements of the science that has evolved since his day, but these later requirements are very largely developments from the model set by Blades. Most important of all, as a practical craftsman he recognized that everything depended on accurate observation and understanding of the material that Caxton's workmen had to work with, and primarily his type fonts.

Henry Bradshaw

Henry Bradshaw, librarian of Cambridge University, was steeped in the academic scholarship that Blades knew little about. Finding himself in charge of a large number of old books that were of very little use in the places where his predecessors had shelved them, he devised a new arrangement into which they could be grouped. This worked out into what he called the "natural history" method of classifying all fifteenth century books as examples of printing instead of by authors or subjects. As perfected by Robert Proctor at the British Museum, this rearranged all incunabula under the press at which each book was produced, in the order in which they appeared. The individual presses were grouped under the localities in which they belonged, in the chronological order in which the printer began working there. The several localities were similarly arranged chronologically under their country, and the countries in the order of the earliest printing in each. This brought order out of previous chaos. It became possible to understand how typography spread over the civilized world and how it influenced the economic practices and cultural development of the different nations.

Study of Type Faces

The scientific system worked perfectly as long as it dealt with precise data. The machinery clogged when its material was messed up by normal human factors. There are obviously different editions of the same work with identical place and date, and it is not always certain which copied the other. Very nearly half of all the extant fifteenth century publications do not carry any statement telling when or where they were produced. These provided the occasion for prolonged and amazingly fruitful comparisons of type faces. All the books that were printed with identical fonts were grouped together, even though there is sometimes no certainty as to where they were printed. An anonymous type not infrequently is found in a book that also contains a type used by a known printer to whom the foundling can then be assigned. This worked satisfactorily for a few years, until it came to be realised that in the fifteenth century, as in later centuries, men sometimes went out of business and disposed of their stock in trade without leaving any record of what had happened.

The study of type faces absorbed the attention of incunabulists for more than two decades. The professionals were still deep in these researches when other investigators began reporting the results of a renewed hunt for fresh documentary evidence in the public archives. The names of printers were found of whose work nothing is known, and more confusingly some who paid taxes in one place at times when their names appear on books from another. The broadening interest that was evidenced by these activities had another even more disturbing effect on the placidity of the subject. The number of recorded incunabula multiplied three, four, perhaps five times. The new titles moreover were almost always more interesting in their contents as well as much rarer than those previously known, and the proportion of unidentifiable pieces was very much greater.

Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke

Fifteenth century typography is a subject that has fascinated students who found occasion to look into it from early in the eighteenth century. It was compact, clean-cut, with a definite body of material that seemed fixed and, within reasonable comprehension, that could not be increased beyond the sum total already in existence within a limited area. By the end of the nineteenth century these advantages were breaking down. The limitations had broken bounds. Something had to be done. The German incunabulists, asserting their right to monopolise this German invention, undertook to bring the material under control. They proposed to prepare and publish a "Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke" which should describe adequately every discoverable piece of fifteenth century typographic workmanship. A special mission was sent to Italy to sift the contents of every big and little hiding place where these things might lurk. England and France had already begun a similar rounding up of their national holdings, and now dropped other bibliographical programs to expedite the larger undertaking. America did what it could by attempting to compile a census of copies in public and private collections. An enormous amount of data was accumulated at Berlin, and publication proceeded with the inevitable delays incidental to the thoroughgoing attempt to settle all the uncertainties for all time. Then came war, with the letter "F" unfinished.

Census of 1919

Shortly, another incunabular situation arose in America that asked for alleviation. The *Census of Fifteenth Century Books Owned in America* which was printed by the New York Public Library in 1919 had done its work almost too well. It had proved valuable as a union catalog of the principal collections, with a single important exception. It made it possible for students whose researches led them to these books to locate copies of the widely scattered titles. It stimulated interest and appreciation in the custodians of libraries, both those who had these books and those who lacked them. One such, Henry E. Huntington, saw the opportunity to gain distinction for his collection by making a determined attempt to secure whatever the book market offered that was not registered as being in any other American institution. The booksellers did what they could, and "No copy in America" became a commonplace in their catalogs, some of which listed not a single item that was to be found in the *Census*.

Luckily, the impending need for a more careful second edition had been quickly foreseen by Margaret Bingham Stillwell. She had helped in the preparation of the *Census* of 1919 and had gone on to the charge of the Rush C. Hawkins collection of *First Books by the First Printers* in the Annmary Brown Memorial at Providence. That special library of fifteenth century books was obviously the strategic place to establish a clearing house for information about American incunabula, and Miss Stillwell went about establishing her right to expect to be notified whenever an addition was made to any other collection. Eventually after many discouragements her foresighted persistence was rewarded. The Bibliographical Society of America, which had sponsored the first *Census,* secured the necessary funds to pay for assistance in completing the material. An advisory committee with Lawrence C. Wroth as chairman was appointed to stand back of Miss Stillwell and provide any needed support.

Second Census

The "Second Census" spread its net over Canada and Mexico as well as the United States. It is a volume of xlv and 619 pages, listing 35,232 copies (about 13,200 in 1919) of 11,132 titles (6292 in 1919) in 332 public (173 in 1919) and 390 private (255 in 1919) collections.

That the work must go on, backed by some adequate financial support, is clear from the three pages of addenda, presenting information that arrived too late for inclusion at the proper place. It shows 108 additional copies for titles already entered, and twenty new titles not before available for American students. Fourteen entries record a significant gift to the Dartmouth College library. Seventeen other entries marked "change" are in the nature of errata, and look as if the responsibility might be evenly divided between the technical staff and the printer's compositor, Mr. Skillings, to whom the Preface pays a laboriously earned tribute. There are undoubtedly other errors in the eighty thousand lines of nondescript medieval Latin and tricky bibliographical contractions spiced with numberless meaningless figures, but there is every reason to believe that these will prove to be amazingly few. It is a volume that bids fair to become a landmark of American typographic craftsmanship as well as of scholarly standards and achievement.—*George P. Winship.*

News from

General

The Carnegie Corporation of New York has appropriated $55,800 for the development of libraries in technological colleges. Sums ranging from $3000 to $6000 have been granted eleven colleges for the purchase of books for general undergraduate reading. These grants are to be expended over a three-year period beginning in October 1941.

East

Dickinson College of Carlisle, Pa., has inaugurated reading periods to encourage student reading for research and leisure in the new James W. Bosler Library. The reading periods, during which time the student will be released from attendance at classes, last two weeks in each semester, and are preceded by conferences between student and professor on the proposed independent study.

The Bulletin Board is the name of the new weekly mimeographed sheet issued by the staff of Pennsylvania State College Library, Willard P. Lewis, librarian. It is described as a "publication of, by, and for the library staff." In addition to weekly news items, the sheet carries a brief list of new and interesting books. The first number appeared on November 3.

Among the papers recently transferred to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library were letters of opinion received by the President from the public on various domestic and foreign policies of the administration during 1933-41; letters from clergymen in reply to the President's circular request of September 23, 1935, for advice on problems of social legislation and unemployment; correspondence of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1934-37; and letters received by James A. Farley from leaders of the Democratic party during the campaigns of 1930, 1932, and 1936. The work of arranging the manuscripts and books is going forward rapidly but they are not yet available for use.

On September 18, 1941, Solon J. Buck, director of research and publications in the National Archives since 1935, became the second Archivist of the United States. He succeeded R. D. W. Connor who resigned to accept a newly-endowed professorship of American history and jurisprudence at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

In keeping with a policy already followed by several universities, New York University is permitting its candidates for doctoral degrees to reproduce their theses on microfilm. A substantial saving is thus afforded the student. Of a distinct advantage to the library will be the slight decrease in the demand for shelf space.

South

Recent gifts to the library of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., E. G. Swem, librarian, include a collection of letters of Thomas Ritchie and members of the Harrison family at Brandon for the years 1830 to 1875. A collection of thirty George Mason papers has been added to the library's collection which already includes letters by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, George Washington, and John Marshall.

the Field

Another gift of considerable significance was that of the Cabell papers for the period from 1740 to 1850, during which time five generations of the Cabell family attended William and Mary.

The Merner-Pfeiffer Library of Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens, was dedicated on November 5, 1941. Frances Mackey is librarian.

The Joint University Library of Nashville, Tenn., A. F. Kuhlman, director, was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies on Friday and Saturday, December 5 and 6, 1941. The dedicatory exercises marked the culmination of a program of cooperation between George Peabody College for Teachers, Scarritt College, and Vanderbilt University which was actively begun in 1935. Jointly owned and directed and giving service to three institutions, the Joint University Library represents the most advanced stage that library cooperation in this country has reached.

Middle West

Colorado State College Library, Fort Collins, James G. Hodgson, librarian, held open house for the faculty on December 1, 1941, in celebration of having grown to one hundred thousand volumes. The regular monthly faculty meeting was held in the library at this time. Through appropriate talks, attention was drawn to the problems and opportunities of libraries today and tomorrow. Following tea which was served in the building, members of the faculty were invited to examine a series of exhibits illustrating various activities of the library and staff.

The South Dakota State College, Brookings, H. Dean Stallings, librarian, has added shelves to the stacks of its library sufficient to house fifty thousand additional volumes. Thus will its shelf capacity be brought to 125,000 volumes. Shelves to support about eighty thousand volumes more can be installed.

For several years the efforts of Indiana librarians have been directed at improving facilities for the training of school librarians. Working in conjunction with the department of public instruction, the state board of education, and the supervisor of school libraries, this group is now engaged in a study of the problems connected with the training of school librarians.

The James Jerome Hill Reference Library of St. Paul, Helen K. Starr, librarian, has received the five hundred-volume accounting and taxation library of the late Herbert M. Temple of St. Paul.

A readers' advisory service to assist students in discovering the bibliographical resources of the Antioch College Library, Yellow Springs, O., has been announced by Paul H. Bixler, librarian.

The 1941 Kansas legislature appropriated $250,000 for building and equipping a library building on the campus of the State Teachers College at Emporia.

Southwest

The University of Texas Library, Austin, Donald Coney, librarian, has acquired for its archives collection more than a thousand photographs of old buildings still standing in Texas. These photographs were made as a part of a nationwide project of the Historic American Buildings Survey.

Far West

The Library Associates of Occidental College, Los Angeles, an organization of alumni and friends interested in the development and enrichment of the library, held their first meeting on November 24, 1941, with Louis B. Wright of the Huntington Library as the speaker. Elizabeth J. McCloy is librarian.

The library of the University of California at Los Angeles, John E. Goodwin, librarian, has acquired the library of ex-Senator Thomas P. Gore of Oklahoma. The collection includes more than four hundred volumes in the field of money and banking.

A committee of the state college presidents, under Aymer Hamilton of Chico State College, has been working on proposals for the reclassification of library positions in the state of California. The chairman proposed a classification scheme similar to that of the teaching faculty, with a salary schedule on a par with that body.

The library of the University of Southern California, Miss Christian R. Dick, librarian, received from the estate of librarian emeritus Charlotte M. Brown, who died on March 11, 1941, an excellent collection of books, pamphlets, and clipings on the Catalina Islands.

Personnel

Robert A. Miller, director of libraries of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, has been appointed director of libraries of Indiana University, Bloomington, effective March 1, 1942. Stephen A. McCarthy, now associate director, is succeeding him as director.

Alma Bennett became librarian of Ottawa University on September 1, 1941. She succeeded Virginia Richards who resigned.

Fina C. Ott, formerly librarian at Alma College, Alma, Mich., became librarian of Washburn Municipal University, Topeka, Kan., on September 1, 1941, succeeding Jessie Dean who retired in August after thirty-eight years as librarian.

Paul W. Winkler has been appointed librarian of McPherson College, McPherson, Kan., to succeed Claxton Helms.

BENJAMIN E. POWELL

Nominations for A.C.R.L. Officers, 1942-43

General Association

President: Mabel L. Conat, Public Library, Detroit

Vice President: Clarence S. Paine, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Robert A. Miller, Indiana University Library, Bloomington

John S. Richards, University of Washington Library, Seattle

John R. Russell, University of Rochester Library, Rochester, N.Y.

Charles B. Shaw, Swarthmore College Library, Swarthmore, Pa.

General Director: Robert Usher, Tulane University Libraries, New Orleans

Willis H. Kerr, Claremont College Libraries, Claremont, Calif.

Lewis F. Stieg, Hamilton College Library, Clinton, N.Y.

Anna M. Tarr, Lawrence College Library, Appleton, Wis.

Sections

Agricultural Libraries

Chairman: Lucia Haley, Oregon State College Library, Corvallis

Secretary: Emily L. Day, Bureau of Agricultural Economics Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Director: Janice Stewart Brown, Bureau of Plant Industry Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

(These officers have already been elected.)

College Libraries

Chairman: Julian S. Fowler, Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, O.

Secretary: Nellie M. Homes, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Junior College Libraries

Chairman: Wave L. Noggle, Virginia Junior College, Virginia, Minn.

Secretary: Mary H. Clay, Junior College Division Library, Louisiana State University, Monroe

Mrs. Mildred Peterson McKay, Colby Junior College, New London, N.H.

Reference Librarians

Chairman: Mary N. Barton, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore

Secretary: Jack Dalton, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Libraries of Teacher-Training Institutions

Chairman: Eleanor W. Welch, Illinois State Normal University Library, Normal

Secretary: Barcus Tichenor, Ball State Teachers College Library, Muncie, Ind.

University Libraries

Chairman: John J. Lund, Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.

Secretary: Harry Clemons, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Director: Charles E. Rush, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Association of College and Reference Libraries
Officers for 1941-42

General Association

President: Donald Coney, Librarian, University of Texas, Austin

Vice-President: Mabel L. Conat, Reference Librarian, Public Library, Detroit

Secretary: B. E. Powell, Librarian, University of Missouri, Columbia

Treasurer: Constance M. Winchell, Reference Librarian, Columbia University, New York City

A.C.R.L. Representatives on A.L.A. Council: J. Periam Danton, Librarian, Temple University, Philadelphia

Mrs. Vera S. Cooper, Librarian, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

John S. Richards, Associate Librarian, University of Washington, Seattle

Charles F. McCombs, Superintendent, Main Reading Room, New York Public Library

Hazel E. Armstrong, Librarian, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute

G. Flint Purdy, Librarian, Wayne University, Detroit

Fanny Alice Coldren, Reference Librarian, University of California at Los Angeles

William H. Jesse, Assistant Director, University of Nebraska Libraries, Lincoln

Sections

Agricultural Libraries

Chairman: Eugene H. Wilson, Assistant Librarian, Iowa State College, Ames

Secretary: Emily L. Day, Library Specialist in Cotton Marketing, Bureau of Agricultural Economics Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

College Libraries

Chairman: Anna M. Tarr, Librarian, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

Secretary: Foster E. Mohrhardt, Librarian, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

Junior College Libraries

Chairman: Maysel O'H. Baker, Librarian, La Salle-Peru Township High School and Junior College, La Salle, Ill.

Secretary: Wave L. Noggle, Librarian, Virginia Junior College, Virginia, Minn.

Libraries of Teacher-Training Institutions

Chairman: Charles V. Park, Librarian, Michigan Central State Teachers College, Mount Pleasant

Secretary: Frances G. Hepinstall, Librarian, State Teachers College, Buffalo

Reference Librarians

Chairman: Fanny A. Coldren, Reference Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles

Secretary: Edna J. Grauman, Head of Reference Department, Free Public Library, Louisville

University Libraries

Chairman: Harold L. Leupp, Librarian, University of California, Berkeley

Secretary: Winifred Ver Nooy, Reference Librarian, University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago